

THE SPIRIT OF GOD

SUPPLEMENTS TO
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

Formerly Philosophia Patrum

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE
AND LANGUAGE

EDITORS

J. DEN BOEFT — R. VAN DEN BROEK — A.F.J. KLIJN
G. QUISPEL — J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

VOLUME XXVII



THE SPIRIT OF GOD

THE EXEGESIS OF 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS
IN THE PNEUMATOMACHIAN CONTROVERSY
OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

BY

MICHAEL A.G. HAYKIN



E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1994

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Haykin, Michael A. G.

The Spirit of God : the exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian controversy of the fourth century / by Michael A.G. Haykin.

p. cm. — (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, ISSN 0920-623X ; v. 27)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004099476 (alk. paper)

1. Pneumatomachi. 2. Bible. N.T. Corinthians—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—History—Early church, ca. 30-600. 3. Holy Spirit—History of doctrines—Early church, ca. 30-600. I. Title. II. Series.

BT1464.H37 1994

227'.206—dc20

94-26024
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Vigiliae Christianae / Supplements]

Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae : formerly Philosophia Patrum ; texts and studies of early Christian life and language.

– Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.

Früher Schriftenreihe

ISSN 0920-623X

NE: HST

Vol. 27. Haykin, Michael A. G.: The spirit of God. - 1994

Haykin, Michael A. G.:

The spirit of God : the exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the pneumatomachian controversy of the fourth century / by Michael A. G. Haykin. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1994

(Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae ; Vol. 27)

ISBN 90-04-09947-6

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 90 04 09947 6

© Copyright 1994 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*To
Joyce E. Lowe,
“who has been a mother to me”
(Rom 16:13).*

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	1
I. The Pneumatochian Controversy: Background and Development	9
1. Origen	9
2. Athanasius and the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis	18
3. Basil and the Pneumatomachi of Sebaste	24
Excursus I. The Pneumatology of Dionysius of Alexandria	50
Excursus II. The Date of Basil's <i>De Fide</i>	53
Excursus III. The Date of Basil's <i>Hom.</i> 24	56
II. Athanasius of Alexandria	59
1. <i>Epistulae iv ad Serapionem</i>	59
2. Athanasius as Exegete	63
3. The Incomprehensibility and Ineffability of God	67
4. The Illustration of Fountain-River-Draught	71
5. The Uncreated Spirit	77
a. The Nature of the Spirit	78
b. The Uniqueness of the Spirit	83
c. The Spirit of Sanctification	86
d. The Spirit as Unction	88
e. The Indwelling Spirit	91
6. The Spirit in the Trinity	93
a. The Indivisible Trinity	94
b. The Spirit of Prophecy	97
7. Summary	100
III. Basil of Caesarea	104
1. <i>Liber de Spiritu sancto</i>	104
2. Basil as Exegete	114
3. The Spirit of Knowledge	120

4. The Spirit in Baptism	129
5. The Spirit of God	137
6. The Charismatic Spirit	147
7. The Spirit as Lord	152
8. The Spirit in the Doxology	159
9. Summary	166
IV. The Pneumatomachian Controversy: Conclusion	170
1. Gregory of Nazianzus and the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople	170
2. Gregory of Nyssa and the Pneumatomachi of Asia Minor	185
Excursus IV. The Date of the Delivery of Gregory of Nazianzus' <i>Or.</i> 41	202
Excursus V. The Date of the Delivery of Gregory of Nazianzus' <i>Or.</i> 34	205
Conclusion	208
Select Bibliography	231
I. Primary Sources: Texts and Translations	231
II. Secondary Sources	235
Indices	245
Index of Subjects	245
Index of Persons	247
Index of References to Ancient Texts	250
Index of Biblical References	252

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My experience of writing this book, which is substantially my doctoral thesis, is well expressed by Jesus' statement to his disciples: "Others have laboured, and you have entered into their labours." At every stage of the book, I have been aware of the great debt which I owe to the work of other scholars. Foremost among these scholars is my thesis supervisor, Professor John P. Egan, S.J., who was willing to devote a substantial amount of his time for four years to the direction of my thesis. Moreover, through his love for the Fathers and sensitivity to the many nuances of their thought, he has taught me how to read their writings and appreciate their achievement. I will always be indebted to him.

I also wish to express my gratitude to my professors at Wycliffe College, Toronto, and in particular to the former Principal, Dr. Reginald F. Stackhouse, for his support during my many years of study at Wycliffe. A special word of thanks is due to the late Dr. Jakob Jocz, whose request for an essay on Novatian's trinitarian theology in 1975 initiated me into the fascinating study of patristics. Thanks are also due to Professor Paul J. Fedwick, who kindly answered numerous questions I had concerning Basil of Caesarea. I am extremely grateful for the help and encouragement I received from the late L.J. Shein, Professors John M. Rist, Mary Ann Donovan, Alasdair Heron, Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, Reinhart Staats, and Elena Cavalcanti. I have profited greatly from conversations with L. Gregory Bloomquist, to whom I am also indebted for a number of translations of texts of Origen which have been preserved only in Latin.

Particular thanks must also go to the unsung heroes of patristic scholarship: to Lorna Hassell, Gayle Ford, and Katie Woelfle, the present and past staff of Wycliffe College Library, for their labours on my behalf, in particular with regard to obtaining books not available at the University of Toronto; Moira Hughes, who, with great skill and patience, typed the original thesis; and to Debbie Ebel and Brent R.A. Wilson who helped to transform the thesis into a book.

My deepest thanks are reserved for the Lord, to whom be "glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus to all generations forever and ever".

Note:

The author wishes to thank the *Scottish Journal of Theology* for permission to reproduce material from two articles which previously appeared in its pages: “‘The Spirit of God’: The Exegesis of I Cor. 2:10-12 by Origen and Athanasius”, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 35 (1982), 513-528, and “‘A Sense of Awe in the Presence of the Ineffable’: I Cor. 2:11-12 in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century”, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 41 (1988), 341-357.

ABBREVIATIONS

I. *Primary Works*

Primary works are cited by books, chapters and/or sections, where these exist, according to the enumeration of the critical text, for example, Didymus, *Trin.* 2.6.10. Where there is no critical text, or where the critical text does not provide an enumeration of the books, chapters and/or sections of the primary work, the Migne enumeration of books, chapters and/or sections is followed. For instance, the Migne enumeration of Gregory of Nyssa's *Maced.* is followed, since Friedrich Mueller's critical edition does not provide section divisions.

Critical texts are cited by page and line of the edition, except in the case of Basil's letters, where the appropriate volume of Yves Courtonne's edition is also given, and Gregory of Nazianzus' *carm.* 2.1.11 and Ammianus Marcellinus' *Res Gestae*, where only the page is cited.

Reference to the volume, column, and, where provided, letter of the Migne edition is also always given.

A. ORIGEN

- Cels.* 5-8 *Against Celsus*, Books 5-8.
Ed. Marcel Borret, *Origène: Contre Celse*, vols. 3 and 4 (Sources Chrétiennes, nos. 147 and 150; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969); PG 11. 1181A-1632C.
- Comm. in Mt.* *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*.
Ed. Ernst Benz and Erich Klostermann, *Origenes Matthäuserklärung. Vol. I: Die griechischerhaltenen Tomoi*, vol. 10 of *Origenes Werke* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 40; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1935); PG 13.829A-1600C.
- Comm. in Rom.* *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*.
PG 14.837B-1292C.
- Comm. in Tit.* *Fragment from the Commentary on the Epistle to Titus*.
PG 14.1303B-1306C.
- Dial.* *Dialogue with Heraclides*.
Ed. and trans. Jean Scherer, *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 67; Paris: Les Éditions de Cerf, 1960).
- Fr. 1-140 in Jo.* *Fragments 1-140 on the Gospel of John*.
Ed. Erwin Preuschen, *Der JohanneSkommentar*, vol. 4 of *Origenes Werke* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, [vol. 10]; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903), pp.483-574.
- Fr. 1-118 in Lam.* *Fragments 1-118 on Lamentations*.
PG 13.605C-661B.

- Hom. 1,2 in Cant.* *Homilies 1,2 on the Song of Solomon.*
Ed. W.A. Baehrens, *Homilien zu Samuel I, Zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten, Kommentar zum Hohelied*, vol. 8 of *Origenes Werke* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol.33; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1925), pp. 27-60; PG 13.37A-58D.
- Hom. 1-16 in Gen.* *Homilies 1-16 on Genesis.*
Ed. W.A. Baehrens, *Homilien zum Hexateuch*, vol. 6 of *Origenes Werke* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 29; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1920), pp. 1-144; PG 12.145C-253A.
- Hom. 1-26 in Jos.* *Homilies 1-26 on Joshua.*
PG 12.825A-948C.
- Or.* *On Prayer.*
Ed. Paul Koetschau, *Buch V-VIII gegen Celsus, Die Schrift vom Gebet*, vol. 2 of *Origenes Werke* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, [vol. 3]; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), pp. 297-403; PG 11.416A-561B.
- Jo.* *Commentary on the Gospel of John.*
Ed. Erwin Preuschen, *Der Johanneskommentar*, vol. 4 of *Origenes Werke* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, [vol. 10]; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903); PG 14.21A-829B.
- Princ.* *On First Principles.*
Ed. Henri Crouzel and Manlio Simonetti, *Origène: Traité des Principes*, 4 vols. (Sources Chrétiennes, nos. 252-253, 268-269; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978, 1980); PG 11.115A-414A.
- B. ATHANASIUS**
- Ar. 1-3* *Against the Arians, Orations 1-3.*
PG 26. 12A-468A.
- Decr.* *On the Decrees of the Synod of Nicaea.*
Ed. H.-G. Opitz, *Die Apologien*, vol. II/1-7 of his ed., *Athanasius Werke* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935), pp. 1-45; PG 25.416A-476C.
- Dion.* *On the Opinion of Dionysius.*
Ed. H.-G. Opitz, *Die Apologien*, vol. II/1-7 of his ed., *Athanasius Werke* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935), pp. 46-67; PG 25.480A-521B.

- Ep. Afr.* *Letter to the African Bishops.*
PG 26.1029A-1048C.
- Ep. Aeg. Lib.* *Letter to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya.*
PG 25.537A-593A.
- Ep. Amun.* *Letter to Amun.*
PG 26.1169A-1176B.
- Ep. Jo. et Ant.* *Letter to John and Antiochus.*
PG 26.1165C-1168B.
- Ep. Jov.* *Letter to the Emperor Jovian.*
PG 26.813A-820A.
- Ep. Max.* *Letter to the Philosopher Maximus.*
PG 26.1085A-1090D.
- Ep. Pall.* *Letter to Palladius.*
PG 26.1168B-1169A.
- Ep. Serap. 1-4.7* *Four Letters to Serapion.*
PG 26.529A-648B.
- Fug.* *Apology for his Flight.*
Ed. H.-G. Optiz, *Die Apologien*, vol. II/1-7 of his ed.,
Athanasius Werke (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935), pp.
68-86; PG 24.644A-680B.
- Gent.* *Against the Pagans.*
Ed. R.W. Thomson, *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De*
Incarnatione (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1971), pp.
2-132; PG 25.4A-96C.
- H.Ar.* *History of the Arians.*
Ed. H.-G. Optiz, *Die Apologien*, vol. II/1-7 of his ed.,
Athanasius Werke (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935), pp.
183-230; PG 25.696A-796C
- Hom. in Mat. 11:27* *On Matthew 11:27.*
PG 25.207A-220B.
- Inc.* *On the Incarnation of the Word.*
Ed. R.W. Thomson, *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De*
Incarnatione (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1971), pp.
134-276; PG 25.96D-197A.
- Syn.* *On the Synods of Ariminum and Seleucia.*
Ed. H.-G. Optiz, *Die Apologien*, vol. II/1-7 of his ed.,
Athanasius Werke (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935), pp.
231-278; PG 26.681A-793A.

- Tom.* *Tome to the Antiochenes.*
PG 26.796A-809C.
- V. Ant.* *Life of Anthony.*
PG 26.837A-976B.
- C. BASIL
- Bapt.* *On Baptism.*
Ed. Umberto Neri, *Basilio di Cesarea, Il battesimo* (Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1976); PG 31.1513B-1628C.
- Epp.* *Letters.*
Ed. Yves Courtonne, *Saint Basile: Lettres*, 3 vols. (Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1957, 1961, 1966); PG 32.220A-1112D.
- Eun. 1-3* *Against Eunomius, Books 1-3.*
PG 29.497A-669D.
- Fid.* *On Faith*
PG 31.676C-692C.
- Hex.* *On the Hexaemeron.*
Ed. Stanislas Giet, *Basile de Césarée: Homélie sur l'Hexaéméron* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 26; 2nd. ed.; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968); PG 29.4A-208B.
- Hom. 1-2* *On Fasting, Orations 1-2.*
PG 31.164A-197C.
- Hom. 13* *Exhortation to Holy Baptism.*
PG 31.424A-444C.
- Hom. 15* *On Faith.*
PG 31.464B-472B.
- Hom. 20* *On Humility.*
PG 31.525A-540B.
- Hom. 24* *Against the Sabellians, Arius, and the Anomoeans.*
PG 31.600B-617B.
- Hom. in Ps. 28* *On Psalm 28*
PG 29.280C-305B.
- Hom. in Ps. 29* *On Psalm 29.*
PG 29.305B-324A.

<i>Hom. in Ps. 32</i>	<i>On Psalm 32.</i> PG 29.324A-349A.
<i>Hom. in Ps. 33</i>	<i>On Psalm 33.</i> PG 29.349B-385C.
<i>Hom. in Ps. 44</i>	<i>On Psalm 44.</i> PG 29.388A-413D.
<i>Hom. in Ps. 45</i>	<i>On Psalm 45.</i> PG 29.416A-432A.
<i>Hom in Ps 48</i>	<i>On Psalm 48.</i> PG 29.432A-460A.
<i>Jud.</i>	<i>On the Judgment of God.</i> PG 31.653A-676C.
<i>Moral.</i>	<i>Morals.</i> PG 31.700B-869C.
<i>Reg. br.</i>	<i>Shorter Rules.</i> PG 31.1080A-1305B.
<i>Reg. fus.</i>	<i>Longer Rules.</i> PG 31.889A-1052C.
<i>Spir.</i>	<i>On the Holy Spirit.</i> Ed. C.F.H. Johnston, <i>The Book of Saint Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, on the Holy Spirit</i> (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1892), pp. 13-157; PG 32.68A-217C.
<i>Struct. hom. 1-2</i>	<i>On the Creation of Man, Orations 1-2.</i> Ed. Alexis Smets and Michel van Esbroeck, <i>Basile de Césarée: Sur l'origine de l' homme</i> (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 160; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970); PG 30.9A-61C.

D. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS

<i>Carm. 1.1.3</i>	<i>On the Holy Spirit.</i> PG 37.408A-415A.
<i>Carm. 2.1.11</i>	<i>On his Life.</i> Ed. Christoph Jungck, <i>Gregor von Nazianz: De vita sua</i> (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1974); PG 37.1029A-1166A.

- Epp.* *Letters.*
Ed. Paul Gallay, *Gregor von Nazianz Briefe* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, vol. 53; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969); PG 37.21A-388B.
- Or. 12* *To his Father, when he had entrusted to him the Church at Nazianzus.*
PG 35.844A-849C.
- Or. 20* *On the Theology and Installation of Bishops.*
Ed. Justin Mossay and Guy Lafontaine, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 20-23* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 270; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1980), pp. 56-84; PG 35.1065A-1080C.
- Or. 21* *In Honour of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria.*
Ed. Justin Mossay and Guy Lafontaine, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 20-23* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 270; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1980), pp. 110-192; PG 35.1081A-1128C.
- Or. 25* *In Honour of Hero the Philosopher.*
PG 35.1197A-1225B.
- Or. 26* *On Himself.*
PG 35.1228A-1252C.
- Or. 27-31* *Theological Orations.*
Ed. Paul Gallay and Maurice Jourjon, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques)* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 250; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978); PG 36.12A-172B.
- Or. 33* *Against the Arians, and on Himself.*
PG 36.213A-237A.
- Or. 34* *On the Arrival of the Egyptians.*
PG 36.241A-256A.
- Or. 36* *On Himself.*
PG 36.265A-280C.
- Or. 39* *On the Holy Lights.*
PG 36.336A-360A.
- Or. 41* *On Pentecost.*
PG 36.428A-452C.
- Or. 42* *Last Farewell.*
PG 36.457A-492C.
- Or. 43* *Funeral Oration on Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea.*
PG 36.493A-605A.

- Test.* *Testament.*
PG 37.389A-396B.
- E. GREGORY OF NYSSA
- Comm. not.* *On Common Notions.*
Ed. Friedrich Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica Minora. Pars I*, vol. III/1 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958), pp. 17-33; PG 45.176A-185D.
- Epp.* *Letters.*
Ed. Giorgio Pasquali, *Gregorii Nysseni Epistulae*, vol. VIII/2 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (2nd ed.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959); PG 46.1000C-1108B.
- Maced.* *On the Holy Spirit against the Macedonians.*
Ed. Friedrich Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica Minora. Pars I*, vol. III/1 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958), pp. 89-115; PG 45.1301C-1333D. The critical edition provides for the first time the complete text of this treatise. The conclusion of the treatise (pp. 113.9 - 115.32) is not contained in previous editions.
- Melet.* *Funeral Oration on Bishop Meletius.*
Ed. Andreas Spira in Gunter Heil *et al.*, eds., *Sermones. Pars I*, vol. IX of Werner Jaeger and Hermann Langerbeck, eds., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), pp. 441-457; PG 46.852A-864B.
- Or. dom. 3* *On the Lord's Prayer, Oration 3.*
PG 44.1148D-1161A.
- Ordin.* *On his Ordination.*
Ed. Ernst Gebhardt in Gunter Heil *et al.*, eds., *Sermones. Pars I*, vol. IX of Werner Jaeger and Hermann Langerbeck, eds., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), pp. 331-341; PG 46.544A-553B.
- Tres dii* *That there are not three gods.*
Ed. Friedrich Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica Minora. Pars I*, vol. III/1 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958), pp. 35-57; PG 45.116A-136A.
- Trin.* *To Eustathius on the Holy Trinity.*
Ed. Friedrich Mueller, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica Minora. Pars I*, vol. III/1 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958), pp. 3-16; PG 32.684C-696C. The greater part of this treatise is found

among the letters of Basil as *ep.* 189 in the Migne edition. It is probably for this reason that it is not included among Nyssen's works in the Migne edition.

- V. Macr.* *Life of Macrina.*
Ed. V. Woods Callahan in Werner Jaeger, J.P. Cavarinos and V. Woods Callahan, eds., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Ascetica*, vol. VIII/1 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), pp. 370-414; *PG* 46.960A-1000B.

F. OTHER AUTHORS

i) Ammianus Marcellinus

- Res Gestae* 14-19 *History*, Books 14-19.
Ed. J.C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus* (The Loeb Classical Library, no. 300; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1963).

ii) Amphilochius of Iconium

- Ep.syn.* *Synodal letter.*
Ed. Cornelis Datema, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera* (Corpus Christianorum, series graeca, vol. 3; Turnhout: Brepols/Leuven: University Press, 1978), pp. 219-221; *PG* 39.93B-97C.

- RF* *On Right Belief.*
Ed. L. van Rompey in Cornelis Datema, *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera* (Corpus Christianorum, series graeca, vol. 3; Turnhout: Brepols/Leuven: University Press, 1978), pp. 315-319.

iii) Didymus the Blind

- Trin.* 2.1-7 *On the Trinity*, Book 2, chapters 1-7.
Ed. Ingrid Seiler, *Didymus der Blinde: De trinitate, Buch 2, Kapitel 1-7* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, vol. 52; Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1975); *PG* 39.441C-600B.

iv) Epiphanius of Salamis

- Haer.* 65-80 *Medicine-chest against 80 Heresies*, Chapters 65-80.
Ed. Karl Holl, *Panarion Haer. 65-80, De Fide*, vol. 3 of his ed., *Epiphanius Ancoratus und Panarion* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 37; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933), pp. 1-496.12; *PG* 42.9A-773B.

v) Eunomius of Cyzicus

Exp. fid. *Exposition of Faith.*
PG 67.587C-590B.

vi) Eusebius of Caesarea

E. th. *Ecclesiastical Theology.*
 Ed. Erich Klostermann, *Gegen Marcell, Über die kirchliche Theologie, Die Fragmente Marcells*, vol. 4 of *Eusebius Werke* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, [vol. 14]; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), pp. 66-182; *PG 24.825C-1045D.*

vii) Hippolytus of Rome

Noët. *Against the Sect of a Certain Noëtus.*
 Ed. Robert Butterworth, *Hippolytus of Rome: Contra Noëtum* [Heythrop Monographs, no. 2; London: Heythrop College (University of London), 1977]; *PG 10.804A-829B.*

viii) Jerome

Ep. 124 *Letter to Avitus.*
 Ed. Isidore Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, vol. 3 (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 56; 1918 ed.; rpt. New York/London: Johnson Reprint Co., 1961), pp. 96-117; *PG 22.1059-1072.*

Vir. *Famous Men.*
PG 23.631A-759A.

ix) Julian the Apostate

Epp. *Letters.*
 Ed. Joseph Bidez, *L'Empereur Julien: Oeuvres complètes*, vol. I/2 (2nd ed.; Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1960).

x) Justinian I

Or. *Against Origen.*
 Ed. Eduard Schwartz, *Collectio Sabaitica*, tome III of his ed., *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1940), pp. 189.18-214.9; *PG 86/1.945D-989D.*

xi) Macarius-Symeon

Hom. *Spiritual Homilies.*
 Ed. Hermann Dörries, Erich Klostermann and Matthias

Kroeger, *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios* (Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 4; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1964); PG 34.449A-822A.

xii) The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed

C *The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed.*
Ed. G.L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Constantinopoli* (Testi e ricerche de scienze religiose, vol. 2; Rome: Herder, 1967), pp. 244-250.

xiii) Pamphilus of Caesarea

Apol. *Apology for Origen.*
PG 17.521B-616A.

xiv) Philostorgius

H.e. *Ecclesiastical History.*
Ed. Joseph Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines Arianischen Historiographen* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 21; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913), pp. 4-150; PG 65.460A-624A.

xv) Plotinus

Enn. *Enneads.*
Ed. Paul Henry and H.-R. Schwyzer, *Plotini Opera*, 3 vols. (Museum Lessianum, Series Philosophica, vols. 33-35; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1951, 1959, 1973).

xvi) Ps.-Athanasius

Inc. et c. Ar. *On the Incarnation and against the Arians.*
PG 26.984A-1028A.

Haer. *Against all Heresies.*
PG 28.501A-524C.

xvii) Ps.-Basil

DS *On the Spirit.*
Ed. Paul Henry, *Les États du Texte de Plotin*, vol. 1 of his *Études Plotiniennes* (Museum Lessianum, Section Philosophique, no. 20; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer et C^{ie}, 1938), pp. 185-196.

Hom. Spir. *On the Holy Spirit.*
PG 31.1429A-1437B.

xviii) Rufinus of Aquileia

Adult. *On the Falsification of Origen's Works.*
PG 17.615B-632B.

xix) Socrates

H.e. *Ecclesiastical History.*
PG 67.29-841B.

xx) Sozomen

H.e. *Ecclesiastical History.*
 Ed. Joseph Bidez and G.C. Hansen, *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, vol. 50; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960); *PG* 67.844A-1629C.

xxi) Tertullian

Prax. *Against Praxeas.*
 Ed. Ernest Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948); *PL* 2.177A-220C.

xxii) Theodore of Mopsuestia

Maced. *Controversy with the Macedonians.*
PO 9.637-667.

xxiii) Theodoret of Cyrrhus

H.e. *Ecclesiastical History.*
 Ed. Leon Parmentier and Felix Scheidweiler, *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, vol. 44; 2nd ed.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954); *PG* 82.881A-1280A.

xxiv) Theodosius I

Cod. Thds. *The Theodosian Code.*
 Ed. Theodor Mommsen, *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, vol. I/1 of his and P.M. Meyer, eds., *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et Leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes* (Berlin: Apud Weidmannos, 1905), pp. 27-906.

II. *Biblical Books and Pseudepigrapha*

Gen	Genesis	Hab	Habbakuk
Ex	Exodus	Zeph	Zephaniah
Lev	Leviticus	Hag	Haggai
Nums	Numbers	Zech	Zechariah
Dt	Deuteronomy	Mal	Malachi
Jos	Joshua	Mt	Matthew
Jgs	Judges	Mk	Mark
Ru	Ruth	Lk	Luke
1, 2 Sam	1, 2 Samuel	Jn	John
1, 2 Kgs	1, 2 Kings	Acts	Acts
1, 2 Chr	1, 2 Chronicles	Rom	Romans
Ezra	Ezra	1, 2 Cor	1, 2 Corinthians
Neh	hNehemiah	Gal	Galatians
Esth	Esther	Eph	Ephesians
Job	Job	Phil	Philippians
Ps(s)	Psalms(s)	Col	Colossians
Prov	Proverbs	1, 2 Thes	1, 2 Thessalonians
Ecc1	Ecclesiastes	1, 2 Tim	1, 2 Timothy
Ct	Song of Solomon	Tit	Titus
Isa	Isaiah	Phlm	Philemon
Jer	Jeremiah	Heb	Hebrews
Lam	Lamentations	Jas	James
Ezek	Ezekiel	1, 2 Petr	1, 2 Peter
Dan	Daniel	1, 2, 3 Jn	1, 2, 3, John
Hos	Hosea	Jude	Jude
Joel	Joel	Apoc	Apocalypse
Am	Amos	Tob	Tobit
Ob	Obadiah	Jdt	Judith
Jon	Jonah	Wis	Wisdom
Mic	Micah	Bar	Baruch
Nah	Nahum	1, 2 Mac	1, 2 Maccabees
		Sir	Sirach

III. *Other Sources*

AB	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
Ae	<i>Aevum</i>
AHC	<i>Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum</i>
ANQ	<i>Andover Newton Quarterly</i>
Ant	<i>Antonianum</i>
ATR	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
Aug	<i>Augustinianum</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BLE	<i>Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique</i>
By	<i>Byzantion</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
CHR	<i>The Catholic Historical Review</i>
CTM	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
DCB	<i>A Dictionary of Christian Biography</i>
Dg	<i>Dialog</i>
DHGE	<i>Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques</i>
Di	<i>Diakonia</i>
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
DRT	<i>The Downside Review</i>
DSp	<i>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité</i>
DTC	<i>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</i>
EP	<i>Ekklesiastikos Pharos</i>
ERE	<i>Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics</i>
Gn	<i>Gnomon</i>
GOTR	<i>The Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i>
Gre	<i>Gregorianum</i>
HDB	<i>Hastings Dictionary of the Bible</i>
He	<i>Hermes</i>
HJ	<i>The Heythrop Journal</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
Ir	<i>Irénikon</i>
IT	<i>The Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
JES	<i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i>
JÖBG	<i>Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KD	<i>Kerygma und Dogma</i>
KP	<i>Der kleine Pauly</i>
Ky	<i>Kyrios</i>
LTK	<i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i>
MH	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
NCE	<i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i>
NT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTT	<i>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
NZSTR	<i>Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religions-philosophie</i>
OC	<i>Oriens Christianus</i>

OCP	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
Oec	<i>Oecumenica</i>
OS	<i>Ostkirchliche Studien</i>
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca</i>
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina</i>
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>
PWK	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
QF	<i>Quatres Fleuves</i>
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
RB	<i>Revue Benedictine</i>
RGG	<i>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
RHE	<i>Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique</i>
RR	<i>Ricerche religiose</i>
RSPT	<i>Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>
RSRel	<i>Revue des Sciences Religieuses</i>
RTL	<i>Revue Théologique de Louvain</i>
SE	<i>Sacris Erudiri</i>
SHERK	<i>The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge</i>
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
Sob	<i>Sobornost</i>
SP	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
SVTQ	<i>St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly</i>
Th	<i>Theology</i>
ThL	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TP	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>
TQ	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
TR	<i>Theologische Revue</i>
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
VC	<i>Verbum Caro</i>
VChr	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VeC	<i>Vetera Christianorum</i>
VS	<i>Vie Spirituelle</i>
Wo	<i>Worship</i>
WS	<i>Word and Spirit</i>
ZKG	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
ZKT	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
ZNTW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

INTRODUCTION

Christian theology in the second half of the fourth century was characterized by a dramatic rise of interest in the person and work of the Holy Spirit. For the historian this rise of interest poses an important question: what are the reasons which lie behind this rise of interest in the Holy Spirit? H.B. Swete, in his still valuable study of early Christian pneumatology, gives the obvious answer to this question when he states that the issue of the Spirit's nature and status was only taken up with ardour when the divinity of the Spirit was explicitly denied.¹ A similar answer is given by M.F. Wiles in his investigation of those principles which determined the development of early Christian doctrine: the presence of heretical ideas about the Spirit's nature necessitated a reply.² On the other hand, C.R.B. Shapland is of the opinion that it was partisans of the Nicene creed, specifically Marcellus of Ancyra, who actually opened the debate about the Spirit.³ As the reason behind the upsurge of interest in the Spirit, Shapland suggests the influence of monasticism.⁴ This latter point receives partial confirmation by Hermann Dörries, who, in his superb monograph on Basil of Caesarea's important contribution to the discussion about the Spirit, takes note of the role which monastic experience played in Basil's formulation of a doctrine of the Spirit.⁵ A.M. Ritter,⁶ however, is not convinced by Dörries' reasoning on this point and he considers that the best explanation for the rise of interest in the Spirit remains either the one suggested by Swete and Wiles, a reaction to the denial of the Spirit's divinity, or else the one which views

¹ *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church. A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1912), pp. 6-7, 170-171.

² *The Making of Christian Doctrine. A Study in the Principles of Early Doctrinal Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. 31-33.

³ *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (London: Epworth Press, 1951), p. 19 and n. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

⁵ *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilii zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, no. 39; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), pp. 7, 152-153, 159-161, 182-184. See also Georg Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* [Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, vol. 21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956], p. 15.

⁶ *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II. Ökumenischen Konzils* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), pp. 293-295, n. 1. However, see his "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel (381) in seiner und in unserer Zeit", *TP*, LVI (1981), 331-332.

the doctrine of the Spirit as a logical development from that of the Son. This latter reason had been proposed by G.L. Prestige, who also regarded the “immediacy” of the Spirit as a reason for the rather late development of pneumatological thought.⁷

Christ had appeared on earth and had made history; but the Holy Spirit was now dwelling in Christian hearts and now making history. The character of His operation as present and internal required time and distance to be achieved before it could present an equally objective appearance to consciousness. The being of God as transcendent and His action as creative are more readily objectified than His presence as immanent. Only when men could look back on historical results of His operation and correlate them with their own immediate experience did they become anxious to substitute such a phrase as ‘God the Holy Spirit’ for ‘the holy prophetic Spirit’ or ‘the Spirit of God,’ or to state explicitly that He was not only a gift or instrument of grace but its Giver.⁸

Yet another reason is offered by G.H. Williams,⁹ who suggests that it is conceivable that the insistence by Nicene and Neo-Nicene bishops on the Spirit’s divinity was linked to their concern to defend themselves against imperial pressure to modify the doctrine promulgated at Nicaea. The authority of these bishops as conduits of the Spirit would obviously be enhanced if the Spirit were regarded as divine. Finally, Thomas Marsh has connected this upsurge of interest in the Spirit to the rediscovery of Pauline and Johannine pneumatology.¹⁰ According to Marsh, this rediscovery actually began in the second century with Irenaeus and his affirmation of the Pauline and Johannine theology of the life-giving Spirit. The rise of interest in the Spirit received added momentum in the fourth century when the Pneumatomachi explicitly denied the divinity of the Spirit. In Marsh’s opinion, the orthodox answer to this assertion of the Pneumatomachi is based upon Pauline pneumatology.¹¹ The definitive form of the orthodox reply, the credal statement of the Council of Constantinople in 381, reveals this dependence most clearly: the description of the Spirit as the “giver of life” recalls Paul’s concept of the Spirit as the source of the new life in Christ. Although it is beyond the scope of this book to suggest which of these reasons, if any, was the dominant one for the rise of interest in the Holy Spirit in the fourth century, the author finds Marsh’s suggestion a provocative one. Adolf

⁷ *God in Patristic Thought* (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1936), p. 80.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

⁹ “Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century”, *CH*, XX (1951), 14.

¹⁰ “Holy Spirit in Early Christian Teaching”, *ITQ*, XLV (1978), 111-113.

¹¹ The suggestion of Marsh (*ibid.*, p. 113) that John Chrysostom, the great Pauline exegete, helped to provide the orthodox believers with an answer to the Pneumatomachi that was rooted in Pauline pneumatology is, of course, quite incorrect. Chrysostom played no significant role in the Pneumatomachian controversy.

von Harnack, in his study of the early Church's reading of the Scriptures, noted that the growth of monasticism at the end of the fourth century was accompanied by a strenuous study of the Scriptures, for "men wished to master the Bible that they might attain to the knowledge of God and deepen their spiritual life".¹² The study of those Scriptures wherein there was a vibrant pneumatology, namely the Pauline corpus and the Gospel of John, may well have stimulated pneumatological thought in the latter half of the fourth century.¹³ But, even if it should turn out to be the case that the Scriptures played only a minor role in provoking thought about the nature and work of the Spirit, one cannot discount their importance in the discussion that ensued once the question of the Spirit had been raised. As H.E.W. Turner observes:¹⁴

The dominance of the argument from Scripture exhaustively stated and skilfully applied in the fourth-century controversies on the divinity of the Holy Spirit is often forgotten by those who are most inclined to accuse Nicene and post-Nicene theology of too deep an engrossment in secular metaphysics.

Even a cursory glance at those treatises on the Spirit written by orthodox authors in the latter half of the fourth century substantiates Turner's observation. Yet, despite the fact that there have been a number of excellent studies in connection with the Pneumatomachian controversy in recent years, this formative role which Scriptural exegesis exercised in the development of pneumatology has received little attention.

Recent scholarly interest in the Fathers as exegetes of Scripture has tended to examine the reasons why a patristic author takes a particular exegetical position. Rowan Greer's fine study of the Greek patristic exegesis of Heb best exemplifies this current tendency.¹⁵ Greer refuses to judge the "correctness" of the Fathers' exegesis, for they have as much right to their interpretations as sixteenth-century or modern exegetes.

¹² *Bible Reading in the Early Church*, trans. J.R. Wilkinson (London: Williams & Norgate, 1912), pp. 129-130.

¹³ For some recent studies of the use of the Gospel of John and the Pauline letters in the early Church, see M.F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1960); *idem*, *The Divine Apostle. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967); T.E. Pollard, *Johannine Christology and the Early Church* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970).

¹⁴ *The Pattern of Christian Truth. A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1954), p. 29.

¹⁵ *The Captain of our Salvation. A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, vol. 15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973). For a statement of his methodology, see *ibid.*, pp. 1-5. See also the summary of this methodology in D.E. Groh, "Changing Points of View in Patristic Scholarship", *ATR*, LX (1978), 460-461.

Rather, he attempts to see how their theological concerns determined the questions which they asked of the Scriptures. These questions, in turn, shaped the answers that were given. This dialectic does not necessarily mean that these Fathers consciously forced the Scriptures into pre-formed theological moulds. The Fathers were honest in their desire to remain faithful to the Scriptures. Nevertheless, the theological principles which they either inherited from traditional views of Scriptural texts or formed in response to what they considered heretical opinions definitely shaped the questions which they asked of the Scriptural text and consequently, the answers which they received from it. The major purpose of this study is to employ this methodology in the critical examination of the use of 1 and 2 Cor by Athanasius of Alexandria and Basil of Caesarea in their defence of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The choice of 1 and 2 Cor is not a totally arbitrary one. 1 Cor is unique among the letters of Paul, for it records in chapters 2-3 and 12-14 the intense pneumatological reflection that was entailed in Paul's response to one of the earliest conflicts about the Holy Spirit, namely the conflict with regard to the nature of his activity in the Christian community. On the other hand, 2 Cor 3, a "homily" on Ex 34, contains a number of important pneumatological insights, especially with regard to the Spirit's transformation of the believer. These texts constitute a significant element of the most mature pneumatology of the New Testament, apart from that of the Johannine writings. And as is evident from the recent discussion about the Spirit that has arisen due to the charismatic renewal, 1 and 2 Cor provide a natural focus for a debate about the Spirit's nature and activity.

Undoubtedly Athanasius and Basil were the most influential figures in the development of an orthodox pneumatology prior to the Council of Constantinople. Athanasius' *ep. Serap*,¹⁶ the first orthodox reply to the Pneumatomachi, laid the foundation upon which the edifice of Greek pneumatology was raised. By comparison, Basil's *Spir.*,¹⁷ of all the treatises on the Spirit written after that of Athanasius, probably did the most to complete the work Athanasius had begun. Consequently, it is these two texts which will form the basis for the examination of how the theological principles of Athanasius and Basil shape the questions which they ask of 1 and 2 Cor and the answers which they obtain. The task of examining the works of Athanasius and Basil for the theological princi-

¹⁶ *Ep. Serap.* 1-4.7 (PG 26.529A-648B). Archibald Robertson [*Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria* (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 4; New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1892), p. lvii] regards these letters as one of Athanasius' three greatest works, the others being *Ar.* 1-3 and *syn.*

¹⁷ *Spir.* (pp. 13-157; PG 32.68A-217C).

ples which guide their exegesis of the Corinthian letters has been made easier by the appearance of a couple of excellent studies in recent years. In 1956 Dörries published a monograph on Basil which included not only a meticulous analysis of the treatise *Spir.*, but also placed this treatise in its historical context by thoroughly examining all that Basil wrote on the subject of the Spirit up to and after 374-375. After the examination of all this literature, Dörries devoted the second half of the monograph to a methodical discussion of the major themes that inform Basil's pneumatology. He concluded with a comparison of Basil's teaching with that of the Council of Nicaea, the Synod of Iconium, and the Council of Constantinople.¹⁸ What Dörries did for the pneumatology of Basil, Adolf Laminski has done for that of Athanasius. In what was originally a doctoral dissertation, Laminski surveys in chronological order all of the Athanasian texts that relate to pneumatology, the chief of which are the letters to Serapion. After a comparison of Athanasius' pneumatological thought with that of the credal statement issued by the Council of Constantinople, Laminski passes to a systematic examination of the themes which dominate Athanasius' doctrine of the Spirit. He concludes with a brief comparison of Athanasius' thought with that of Origen, Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Didymus the Blind and the Cappadocians.¹⁹ Although other studies of Basil's and Athanasius' pneumatology have been widely employed in this study, these two works have probably been the most helpful in understanding the principles which guide Basil's and Athanasius' pneumatological thought.

In his study of the patristic exegesis of Heb, Greer notes that the Cappadocians' theological viewpoint is clearly distinguishable from that of Athanasius. This difference is most apparent in the divergent

¹⁸ *De Spiritu Sancto*. See also the reviews of this monograph by Jean Gribomont, "H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*," *BZ*, L (1957), 452-453; Henry Chadwick, "Literarische Berichte und Anzeigen: Hermann Dörries: *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*," *ZKG*, LXIX (1958), 335-337; Werner Jaeger, "Basilius und der Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas," *ThL*, LXXIII (1958), 255-258; J.N.D. Kelly, "Reviews: *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*. By Hermann Dörries," *JTS*, n.s. IX (1958), 164-166.

¹⁹ *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen. Der Beitrag des Athanasios von Alexandrien zur Formulierung des trinitarischen Dogmas im vierten Jahrhundert* (Erfurter theologische Studien, vol. 23; Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag GMBH, 1969). See also the reviews of this work by Charles Kannengiesser, "Bulletin de théologie patristique: Adolf Laminski. *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen*," *RSR*, LVIII (1970), 622-626; Herbert Musurillo, "Book Reviews: *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen*. By Adolf Laminski," *TS*, XXXI (1970), 766-767; H.J. Sieben, "Besprechungen: Laminski, Adolf, *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen. Der Beitrag des Athanasios von Alexandrien zur Formulierung des trinitarischen Dogmas im vierten Jahrhundert*," *TP*, XLV (1970), 586-588.

christological interpretations of Heb by Athanasius, on the one hand, and by the Cappadocians, on the other.²⁰ It will be discovered that definite differences also exist between Athanasius' and Basil's pneumatological exegesis of 1 and 2 Cor, differences that again can be traced back to their differing theological viewpoints. The examination of Athanasius' and Basil's exegesis of the Corinthian letters forms Chapters II and III. However, since it is impossible to understand a historical phenomenon apart from its historical context,²¹ a consideration of the events which brought forth Athanasius' and Basil's exegesis of the Corinthian correspondence with regard to the Holy Spirit must be given along with the examination of that exegesis. Moreover, such an account in English is long overdue, for almost nothing has been written in English about the course of the Pneumatomachian controversy.²² The presentation of this historical account of the background, development, and conclusion of the Pneumatomachian controversy will make up Chapters I and IV.

While it is clearly erroneous to believe that the Greek Christian authors prior to the Pneumatomachian controversy had little to say about the Holy Spirit, it is true that the question of the Spirit's nature and status was not an acute problem in this period. Nonetheless, a brief sketch of the state of thought about the nature and status of the Spirit which reigned prior to the outbreak of the Pneumatomachian controversy should be given. No better source for such a sketch could be found than the doctrine of the Spirit contained in the work of the renowned Alexandrian scholar of the third century, Origen. Moreover, Origen's failure to provide a consistent explanation of the nature and status of the Spirit is a fitting introduction to the treatment of Athanasius' discussions with the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis. For this group, whom Athanasius disparagingly calls "Tropici", held that the Spirit is a creature who differs from the angels only in degree. Although the origin of this group's pneumatology is a matter of debate, Origen's doctrine of the Spirit certainly had a hand in the genesis of their view. However, their view received a firm rejection from Athanasius, who maintained that the Spirit belongs to

²⁰ *Captain*, pp. 97-98. See also *ibid.*, pp. 98-128, *passim*.

²¹ Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft*, trans. Peter Putnam (New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc./Random House, Inc., 1953), p. 35.

²² The most recent and thorough discussion of the Pneumatomachian controversy is that of W.-D. Hauschild, "Die Pneumatomachen. Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts" (Unpublished theological dissertation, Hamburg, 1967), which unfortunately has not been translated into English. The most recent account in English is that of Shapland (*Letters*, pp. 18-34), which, despite its brevity, contains some good insights. Also valuable from a systematic point of view is Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, vol. 1 of his *The Christian Tradition* (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1975), pp. 211-225.

God and not the creatures. To call him a creature destroys the Christian concept of God, since it makes the Trinity consist of Creator and creature. Though Athanasius' pneumatology provides the framework within which the Church's later doctrine of the Spirit was to take shape, he was content to entrust the elaboration of this doctrine to younger men.²³ Among those authors who built upon the work of Athanasius in the period immediately prior to the Council of Constantinople the most prominent was Basil.²⁴ Basil's interest in the question of the Spirit dates from his conversion to the ascetic movement in 356 and his first theological work, *Eun.* 1-3, composed *ca.* 363-365. His actual involvement in the Pneumatomachian controversy dates however from 372, when some of Basil's friends, bishops and monks, began to criticize him for his prudent handling of the question of the Spirit and his friendship with Eustathius of Sebaste, his mentor in the ascetic life,²⁵ who refused to confess that the Spirit was on an equal footing with the Father and the Son. As the struggle over the question of the Spirit intensified, Basil was forced to renounce his friendship with Eustathius, who became the leader of the Pneumatomachi in northern Asia Minor. By 377 the two men were bitter enemies and Basil had come to the conclusion that the Nicene creed should be expanded to include a statement on the Spirit's conglorification with the Father and the Son. The brief sketch of the pneumatology of Origen, and the treatments of Athanasius' and Basil's discussions with the Pneumatomachi constitute Chapter I, which presents the background to and the development of the Pneumatomachian controversy. The conclusion to the Pneumatomachian controversy is covered in Chapter IV. This final chapter is divided into two sections, which focus on two of the main protagonists at the Council of Constantinople: Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, both of whom regarded themselves as heirs to Basil's labours. Nazianzen's journey to Constantinople in 379 to take up the leadership of the orthodox community in the

²³ Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 213-214, 219-220.

²⁴ Didymus the Blind could also be mentioned, whose treatise on the Spirit, written before 381, is described by Johannes Quasten [*Patrology* (Utrecht/Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers/Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960), III, 87] as "one of the best monographs on the subject written during the fourth century".

²⁵ On Basil's friendship with Eustathius, see Blomfield Jackson, trans. *The Treatise De Spiritu Sancto, The Nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron and the Letters of Saint Basil the Great* (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 8; New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895), pp. xxvii-xxviii; Jean Gribomont, "Eustathe le Philosophe et les voyages du jeune Basile de Césarée", *RHE*, LIV (1959), 115-124; C.A. Frazee, "Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathius of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea", *CHR*, LXVI (1970), 16-33. See also Friedrich Loofs, *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe* (Halle A.S.: Max Niemeyer, 1898), *passim*.

capital of the eastern half of the Roman Empire provided him with his first real opportunity to take a leading role in the dialogue with the Pneumatomachi. However, he soon became discouraged by the tenacity of his opponents and began to urge the orthodox to make an explicit confession of the Spirit's deity. His intransigence with regard to this issue proved to be one of the major reasons why he came to grief at the Council of Constantinople in 381. For the credal statement issued by the council Fathers contained only a reserved description of the Spirit. Nazianzen's vehement criticism of this description went unheeded and, along with other disappointments, led to his departure from the council. Nyssen, on the other hand, always regarded the pneumatological statement of the council in a favourable light. The major reason for this favourable attitude may be the fact that he was probably one of the chief architects of this statement, which all but concluded the struggle over the nature and status of the Spirit. This assumption is partially confirmed by a number of events which indicate the prominent position that he enjoyed at the council, including the delivery of the sermon on the occasion of Nazianzen's installation as bishop of Constantinople. The fact that this sermon also reveals the important influence that certain charismatic ascetics had upon the pneumatology of Gregory reminds the student of this period of a fact which should never be forgotten. The Scriptural exegesis not only of Nyssen, but also of Athanasius and Basil, in support of the Spirit's divinity was never divorced from a living experience of the Spirit's grace and power.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PNEUMATOMACHIAN CONTROVERSY: BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT

1. Origen

Swete, in the above-mentioned study of early Christian pneumatology, notes that the third-century authors from Alexandria played a particularly significant role in the quickening of Christian thought about the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Foremost among these authors was Origen, by whom "the way was opened to the fuller discussion of the theology of the Spirit upon which the fourth century entered".¹

Origen's *princ.* 1.3 and 2.7, written in 229-230,² is the first systematic consideration of the Holy Spirit by a Greek author,³ though sketchy intimations of such a consideration can be found in Irenaeus.⁴ A deeper reflection upon the origin and nature of the Holy Spirit was offered by Origen in a section of his commentary on the Gospel of John, *Jo.* 2.10-12, written in Alexandria in 231.⁵ Needless to say, a complete examination of Origen's pneumatology, of which the texts just mentioned are the chief sources, would require a special monograph. For the present study, the following sketch of Origen's conception of the nature and status of the Spirit is sufficient to indicate the important position which he holds in the development of Greek patristic pneumatology.

¹ *Holy Spirit*, p. 143.

² For the date, see Pierre Nautin, *Origène, Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Christianisme Antique, vol. I; Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), pp. 368-370. For other dates which have been suggested for the composition of *princ.*, see R.P.C. Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), pp. 12-13.

³ W.-D. Hauschild, *Gottes Geist und der Mensch. Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie* (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, vol. 63; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1972), p. 135; Henri Crouzel and Manlio Simonetti, *Origène: Traité des Principes* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 253; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978), II, 56.

⁴ On Irenaeus' concept of the Spirit, see Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 84-94; J.A. Robinson, trans. *St. Irenaeus: The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (London: S.P.C.K., 1920), pp. 34-68; M.A. Donovan, "Karl Rahner's Theory of the Development of Dogma as Tested by the Teaching of Irenaeus on the Trinity" (unpublished M.A. dissertation, St. Michael's College, University of Toronto, 1970), pp. 76-102; H.-J. Jaschke, *Der Heilige Geist im Bekenntnis der Kirche. Eine Studie zur Pneumatologie des Irenäus von Lyon im Ausgang vom altchristlichen Glaubensbekenntnis* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, vol. 40; Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1976).

⁵ For the date, see Nautin, *Origène*, pp. 366-368.

Origen begins his pneumatological investigation in *princ.* from the standpoint of the doctrines handed down by the Apostles:⁶

Then they [the Apostles] handed down that the Holy Spirit is associated with the Father and Son in honour and dignity. It is not yet clearly known whether he is begotten (*natus*) or unbegotten (*innatus*), or whether he is to be understood as a Son of God or not. But these are all matters which ought to be examined from the Holy Scriptures to the best of our ability and to be searched into by diligent study.

This promise of an investigation of the Spirit's nature and relationship to God is fulfilled in *princ.* 1.3. The Scriptures testify to the existence of the Spirit, while the act of baptism bears witness to his importance; for baptism is only complete when administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.⁷ As Franco Bolgiani notes,⁸ Origen's emphasis on the fact that the Spirit is named together with the Father and the Son in liturgical expressions is an implicit invitation to exclude the Spirit from the created realm. In fact, Origen admits that his research into the Scriptures has yielded no text which describes the Spirit as a created being.⁹ Following this admission, Origen devotes *princ.* 1.3.4 to an explication of the role of the Spirit in the revelation of the Father.

⁶ *Princ.* 1. pref. 4 (p.82.84-89; PG 11.117C - 118A). Trans. G.W. Butterworth, *Origen: On First Principles* (New York: Harper and Row, Publ., 1966), p. 3, revised. In Jerome's report of this passage the terms *factus* and *infectus* are used, instead of *natus* and *innatus* [ep. 124.2 (pp. 97.25-98.1; PL 22. 1061)]. Origen almost certainly wrote γενητός and ἀγένητος (Crouzel and Simonetti, *Traité*, II, 14, n.21). It should be borne in mind however that Origen did not distinguish between ἀγένητος and ἀγέννητος, γενητός and γεννητός. In his day, no satisfactory distinction had yet been drawn between creation and derivation (Prestige, *God*, pp. 135-138). For further discussion, see pp.14-15.

Hauschild (*Gottes Geist*, p. 143, n.21) maintains that the phrase "associated with the Father and the Son in honour and dignity" stems from Rufinus. However, in *princ.* 1.3.2 (p. 146.45-51; PG 11.147 B-C) Origen infers the great authority and dignity of the Holy Spirit from his inclusion in the baptismal formula. That same formula probably lies behind the remark here in *princ.* 1. pref. 4. See Georg Kretschmar, "Le Développement de la doctrine du Saint-Esprit du Nouveau Testament à Nicée", *VC*, LXXXVIII (1968), 40. See also Charles Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (1913 ed.; rpt. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 214.

⁷ *Princ.* 1.3.1-2 (pp. 114.18-146.51; PG 11. 146A-147C). With regard to the testimony from the baptismal formula, Origen probably has Mt 28:19 in mind, though he does not cite it. See Helmut Saake, "Der Tractatus pneumatologico-philosophicus des Origenes in περὶ ἀρχῶν I,3", *He*, CI (1973), 95, n.1.

⁸ "La Théologie de l'Esprit Saint. De la fin du I^{er} siècle après Jésus Christ au concile de Constantinople (381)", *QF*, IX (1979), 51.

⁹ Hauschild (*Gottes Geist*, p. 143, n. 21), followed by Jaschke (*Der Heilige Geist*, p. 75, n.59), believes that this statement reveals the hand of Rufinus. Rufinus, according to Hauschild, has suppressed Origen's emphasis on the creaturely nature of the Spirit, lest his mentor appear as the source of the Pneumatomachian heresy. But the differentiation between the Spirit and the created realm is definitely an aspect of Origen's thought. See pp.15-16. See also Henri Crouzel, "Chronique Origénienne: Wolf-Dieter Hauschild. *Gottes Geist und der Mensch: Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie*", *BLE*, LXXVII (1976), 145.

Foreshadowing an important formula of the fourth century,¹⁰ Origen declares that “all knowledge of the Father, when the Son reveals him, is made known to us in the Holy Spirit”.¹¹

Origen concludes this “mini-treatise” on the Spirit with an inquiry as to why salvation is impossible without the presence of the Holy Spirit. The path which this inquiry takes is a description of the realms of activity proper to each of the members of the Godhead.¹² The activity of the Father encompasses all of creation, while that of the Son extends only to that part of the created realm which is rational and that of the Spirit is restricted to the sphere of the Church.¹³ At present, there is no general agreement among scholars as to whether or not Origen understood these different realms of activity to imply a hierarchy of power and status within the Trinity.¹⁴ The source of this disagreement lies in conflicting texts given in the Latin translation of *princ.* by Rufinus,¹⁵ and in the

¹⁰ For the use of this formula by Athanasius and Basil, see pp.94-97, 148-152, 168.

¹¹ *Princ.* 1.3.4 (p.150.98-99; PG 11. 149A). For a discussion of this statement, see Henri Crouzel, *Origène et la 'Connaissance mystique'* (Museum Lessianum, Section Théologique, no. 56; [Paris]: Desclée de Brouwer, 1961), pp. 125-126; Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, p. 131.

¹² *Princ.* 1.3.5 (p. 152.136-142; PG 11.150 A-B)

¹³ *Princ.* 1.3.5-8 (pp. 152.142-164.329; PG 11. 150B-155C). The activity of sanctification is not restricted to the Spirit. In other texts, sanctification is also ascribed to Christ. But, as Hauschild (*Gottes Geist*, p. 138) points out, there is a difference between the sanctification wrought by the Spirit and that wrought by Christ. The sanctification of the Spirit involves a re-shaping of the inner nature of the believer, while that of Christ is given through his word, which imparts moral and ethical motivation to the Christian. See also Manlio Simonetti, “Note sulla teologia trinitaria di Origene”, *VeC*, VIII (1971), 296-297.

¹⁴ For the affirmation of such a hierarchy, see C.W. Lowry, “Origen as Trinitarian”, *JTS*, XXXVII (1936), 235; Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 138-140; *idem*, *Gottes Geist*, pp. 141-143, 148-149; G.W.H. Lampe, “Christian Theology in the Patristic Period” in Hubert Cunliffe-Jones and Benjamin Drewery, eds., *A History of Christian Doctrine* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Ltd., 1978), pp. 73,78; Alasdair Heron, “The Holy Spirit in Origen and Didymus The Blind: a shift in perspective from the third to the fourth century” in A.M. Ritter, ed., *Kerygma und Logos. Beiträge zu den geistgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), p. 307. Cf. Simonetti, “Teologia trinitaria”, pp. 292-294. For the denial of such a hierarchy, see Saake, “Tractatus”, *passim*; *idem*, “La Notion de la Trinité à visée pansotériologique chez Origène et son déplacement intra-ecclésial chez Athanase d’Alexandrie” in Charles Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d’Alexandrie* (Théologie Historique, vol. 27; Paris: Beauchesne, 1974), pp. 295-300; Henri Crouzel “Les Personnes de la Trinité sont-elles de puissance inégale selon Origène, Peri Archon, 1,2,5-8?”, *Gre*, LVII (1976), 109-125.

¹⁵ Rufinus translated *princ.* in 398. Soon after the publication of his translation of the first two books, he came under fire from anti-Origenists. According to Jerome, at one time Rufinus’ friend but now his violent opponent, Rufinus’ translation was a dishonest adaptation in which the most glaring doctrinal errors of Origen were omitted [see J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome. His Life, Writings and Controversies* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1975), pp. 236-240]. In fact, in his preface to his translation of *princ.* 1-2 (p.72.54-64; PG II. 113B-114A), Rufinus admits: “Wherever...we have found in his [Origen’s] book anything contrary to the reverent statements made by him about the Trinity in other places, we have either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage, or reproduced it in a form that agrees with the doctrine which I have often found him affirming elsewhere. If, however, speaking

florilegium of Greek citations in the emperor Justinian's *Or.*, a letter to Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople.¹⁶ According to Rufinus' translation these different realms of activity do not entail differences within the Trinity.¹⁷ On the other hand, according to a citation from Justinian's *Or.*,

as he does to men of knowledge and discernment, he has occasionally expressed himself obscurely in the effort to be brief, we have, to make the passage clearer, added those remarks on the same subject as we have read in a fuller form in his other books, bearing in mind the need of explanation. However, we have said nothing of our own, simply giving back to him his own statements found in other places " (trans. Butterworth, *Origen*, p. xli, revised). Acting on the belief that Origen's writings had been falsified by heretics, Rufinus corrected or omitted those passages in *princ.* which conflicted with orthodox doctrine, especially with regard to the Trinity. An earlier tract of Rufinus, *adult.* (PG 17.615B - 632B), supported this methodology with a letter from Origen to some friends at Alexandria, in which Origen complains of such a falsification of his thought. For a translation and analysis of this letter, see Henri Crouzel, "A Letter from Origen to Friends in Alexandria", trans. J.D. Gauthier in David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin, eds., *The Heritage of the Early Church* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, no. 195; Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1975), pp. 135-150; cf. Nautin, *Origène*, pp. 161-172.

Jerome, for his part, prepared his own "unexpurgated" translation of *princ.*, of which only a few fragments survive in a letter written in 409-410 [*ep.* 124 (pp.96-117; *PL* 22.1059-1072); for the historical context of this letter, see Kelly, *Jerome*, pp. 303-304]. But these fragments are more like reports than citations (Crouzel and Simonetti, *Traité*, II, 14, n.21; 67). An excellent account of the controversy between Rufinus and Jerome can be found in Kelly, *Jerome*, pp. 195-209, 227-263. For recent judgments about Rufinus' translation of *princ.*, see Friedhelm Winkelmann, "Einige Bemerkungen zu den Aussagen des Rufinus von Aquileia und des Hieronymus über ihre Übersetzungstheorie und -methode" in Patrick Granfield and J.A. Jungmann, eds., *Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten* (Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1970), II, 532-547; Basil Studer, "Zur Frage der dogmatischen Terminologie in der lateinischen Übersetzung von Origenes' de Principiis" in Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser, eds., *EPEKTASIS. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), pp.403-414; W.A. Bienert, *Dionysius von Alexandrien. Zur Frage des Origenismus im dritten Jahrhundert* (Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 21; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), pp. 11-15. Cf. also Vinzenz Buchheit, *Tyranni Rufini Librorum Adamantii Origenis Adversus Haereticos Interpretatio* (Studia et Testimonia Antiqua, vol. I; München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1966), pp. xxxv-xxxviii.

¹⁶ This letter was written in 543 at the request of a group of Palestinian monks seeking to secure the condemnation of Origen and his doctrinal errors. The florilegium of citations upon which this letter is based was almost certainly influenced by certain "reports" about Origen's thought in Jerome's *ep.* 124 (see n. 15 above). Therefore, *Or.* may not be an accurate presentation of Origen's thought, but rather contain conclusions drawn from it by anti-Origenists of the fourth century. See Crouzel, "Personnes", pp. 120-123; *idem* and Simonetti, *Traité*, II, 65-70. Cf. Marguerite Harl et al., trans., *Origène. Traité des Principes (Peri Archôn)*, (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1976), p. 14.

¹⁷ See, e.g., *princ.* 1.3.7 (p.160.246-251; *PG* 11. 153C-D): "Nothing in the Trinity (*trinitate*) can be called greater or less, for there is but one fount of deity, who upholds the universe by his word and reason, and sanctifies 'by the spirit of his mouth' all that is worthy of sanctification, as it is written in the Psalm, 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all their power by the spirit of his mouth' [Ps 33:6]" (trans. Butterworth, *Origen*, p. 37). The use of *trinitas* in this passage should be regarded as an interpolation by Rufinus [F.H. Kettler, *Der ursprüngliche Sinn der Dogmatik des Origenes* (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1966), pp. 36-37, n.156; Studer, "Frage", p. 408, n.40]. There are also problems with regard to the citation of Ps 33:6 (Studer, "Frage", p.408, n.40). As Henry Chadwick ["Rufinus and the Tura Papyrus of Origen's commentary on Romans", *JTS*, n.s., X (1959), 18] notes, Rufinus did not shirk from throwing in an extra text for good measure (and here, for doctrinal reasons) in his translations of Origen's works.

the different realms of activity lead to the statement that there is indeed a hierarchy of power within the Godhead: the Father's power is greater than that of the Son, whose power in turn is greater than that of the Spirit.¹⁸ Happily, there are texts extant in the Greek which are unambiguous in their revelation of Origen's conception of the Godhead and the status of the Spirit within it.

One of these texts is the important discussion about the Spirit's origin in *Jo.* 2.10. Origen's starting-point is the Johannine text: "all things were brought into being through him" (Jn 1:3). Origen writes:¹⁹

If then it is acknowledged as true that 'all things were brought into being through him' [Jn 1:3], we must enquire whether the Holy Spirit was brought into being through him. It seems to me that anyone who asserts that he was brought into being and who accepts that 'all things were brought into being through him' [Jn 1:3] will have to admit that the Holy Spirit was brought into being through the Word and that the Word is senior (πρεσβύτερον) to him. And it follows that anyone who is reluctant to describe the Holy Spirit as brought into being through Christ must — if he accepts the statements of this gospel as true — say that he is unbegotten.

There is a third possibility in addition either to allowing that the Holy Spirit was brought into being or to supposing that he is unbegotten. It would be possible for someone to claim that the Holy Spirit does not have any individual existence in distinction from the Father and the Son. But perhaps such a person would be ready to agree that, if one regards the Son as distinct from the Father, it will be a matter of the Spirit being identical with the Father, since there seems to be a clear distinction between the Spirit and the Son in the text: 'Whoever speaks a word against the son of man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will have no forgiveness in this age or in the age to come' [Mt 12:32].

As to the origin of the Spirit, Origen envisages three possibilities: 1) the Spirit is a creature of the Son; 2) the Spirit is unbegotten like the Father; 3) the Spirit has no being (οὐσία) of his own, but is identical with the Father. The two latter possibilities are rejected by Origen. The first, that the Spirit is unbegotten, is a violation of Origen's metaphysical premise

¹⁸ *Or.* (p.208.27-32; *PG* 86/1. 982 B-C): "[Origen said:] God the Father, since he embraces all things, touches each thing that exists, since he bestows on all existence from his own existence; for he is 'He who is' [Ex 3:14]. The Son is inferior in relation to the Father, since he touches only things endowed with reason; for he is subordinate to the Father. The Holy Spirit is still lower in degree, pertaining only to the saints. So then the power of the Father is superior to the Son and the Holy Spirit, while the Son's power is greater than the Holy Spirit; and again the power of the Holy Spirit excels all other holy things" [trans. Henry Bettenson, *The Early Christian Fathers* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), p.239]. Cf. Jerome, *ep.* 124.2-3 (pp. 97.20-98.6; *PL* 22.1060-1061).

¹⁹ Pp. 64.32-65.15; *PG* 14.126C-128A. Trans. Maurice Wiles and Mark Santer, eds., *Documents in Early Christian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 78.

that God the Father alone is a transcendent unity and unbegotten.²⁰ The second, that the Spirit is identical with the Father, was the position of modalistic monarchianism. For advocates of modalistic monarchianism belief in one God necessarily implied the corollary that there is no distinction between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Father, the Son, and the Spirit are simply adjectival descriptions of temporary modes of being which the one God adopts in the implementation of the various stages of divine activity: creation, salvation and sanctification.²¹ Numerous texts bear witness to Origen's vigorous opposition to this conception of God,²² and his rejection of the third possibility with regard to the origin of the Spirit is thus a foregone conclusion.

Consequently, Origen endorses the first possibility as the best explanation for the origin of the Spirit. He writes:²³

The view which asks our approval as the most religious and truthful one is the following: that of all things brought into being through the Word the Holy Spirit is the most honourable and he is first in rank of all the things brought into being by the Father through Christ. And perhaps this is the reason why the Spirit is not called a son of God as well. The only-begotten alone is a son by nature from the very beginning; whereas the Holy Spirit seems to require the Son as an intermediary in respect of his distinct existence — not merely enabling him to exist but enabling him to exist as wise, rational, just and with all the other characteristics he must be thought of as having by participation in the attributes of Christ, of which we have spoken earlier.

This passage appears to place the Holy Spirit in the realm of the other creatures created by the Father through the mediation of the Son. Yet, in order to understand this text correctly it is important to recall that prior to the Council of Nicaea in 325, no distinction was made between

²⁰ See Pollard, *Johannine Christology*, p.91; J.C. McClelland, *God the Anonymous. A Study in Alexandrian Philosophical Theology* (Patristic Monograph Series, no. 4; Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., 1976), pp. 106-107. For a study of Origen's concept of God the Father, see Peter Nemeshegyi, *La Paternité de Dieu chez Origène* (Bibliothèque de Théologie, ser. iv: Histoire de la Théologie, vol. 2; Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1960), esp. pp. 35-52.

²¹ For further discussion of the position of modalistic monarchianism, see Pelikan, *Catholic Tradition*, pp. 176-182.

²² For example, see *Comm. in Rom.* 8.5 (PG 14.1169C); *Comm. in Tit.* (PG 14.1304D-1305A); *Cels.* 8.12 (pp.198.1-200.29; PG 11.1533A-C). For a discussion of Origen's vehement opposition to modalistic monarchianism, see Adolf Harnack, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (3rd ed.; Freiburg I.B./Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1894), I, 720-722; Jean Daniélou, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*, trans. and ed. J.A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd/Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1973), pp. 376-377; Norbert Brox, "Spiritualität und Orthodoxie. Zum Konflikt des Origenes mit der Geschichte des Dogmas" in Ernst Dassman and K.S. Frank eds., *Pietas. Festschrift für Bernhard Kotting* (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, vol. 8; Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1980), pp. 140-154, *passim*.

²³ *Jo.* 2.10 (p.65.15-26; PG 14.128A-129A). Trans. Wiles and Santer, *Documents*, p. 78.

“uncreated” (ἀγέννητος) and “unbegotten” (ἀγέννητος), “created” (γενητός) and “begotten” (γεννητός).²⁴ Since Origen regarded only the Father as ἀγέννητος/ἀγέννητος, the Spirit (and the Son) had to be γενητόν/γεννητόν, a term which was used also to describe the created realm in contrast to God.²⁵ Nevertheless, other texts²⁶ definitely indicate that Origen understood the Spirit (and the Son) to be radically different from the rest of the created realm since he (and the Son) possessed all the qualities of divine life substantially, whereas the creatures possessed them only accidentally. Furthermore, Origen regards the substantial possession of these qualities by the Spirit as eternal.²⁷ Accordingly, the Spirit’s “creation” by the Father through the Son must be considered an eternal one.²⁸ The Spirit is thus distinct from the created realm and definitely a member of the Godhead,²⁹ despite the fact that Origen’s imprecise terminology in *Jo.* 2.10 gives the opposite impression.

Nevertheless, the central concern of Origen in *Jo.* 2.10-12 is not the affirmation of the Spirit’s divinity, but the demonstration of the reality of the Spirit’s distinct existence. The “creation” of the Spirit by the Father through the mediation of the Son establishes this fact. However, the existence of three distinct persons in the Godhead created problems

²⁴ Prestige, *God*, pp. 134-138; Crouzel, *Connaissance*, pp. 97-98; *idem* and Manlio Simonetti, trans., Origène: *Traité des Principes* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 252; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf), I, 37-43.

²⁵ Cf. Henri Crouzel, “Geist (Heiliger Geist)”, *RAC*, IX (1976), 537.

²⁶ For example, see *princ.* 1.6.2 (p.198.57-61; *PG* 11.166C), where Origen states that in the rational beings “goodness does not reside substantially, as it does in God and his Christ and in the Holy Spirit. For only in the Trinity, which is the source of all things, does goodness reside substantially. All others possess it accidentally...” (trans. Butterworth, *Origen*, p. 53, revised). For other texts, see Jacques Dupuis, ‘*L’Esprit de l’homme*’. *Étude sur l’anthropologie religieuse d’Origène* (Museum Lessianum, Section Théologique, no. 62; [Paris]: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967), p. 92, n.12; D.L. Balas, “The Idea of Participation in the structure of Origen’s thought. Christian transposition of a theme of the Platonic tradition” in Henri Crouzel *et al.* eds., *Origeniana* (Quaderni di Vetera Christianorum, no. 12; [Bari]: Università di Bari, Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975), p. 260, n.7. See also Pamphilus, *apol.* 4 (*PG* 17.566B); Prestige, *God*, pp. 136-138; Simonetti, “Teologia trinitaria”, p. 284; Crouzel, “Geist”, col. 536.

²⁷ A good summary of this position is found in *princ.* 4.4.1 (p.402.37-43; *PG* 11.403B): “What is said about the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit must be understood above all time, above all ages, and above all eternity. For that only is the Trinity which surpasses every sense of our understanding, not only temporal but also eternal. It is other things that are outside the Trinity that must be measured in ages and times” [trans. R.A. Greer, *Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, First Principles: Book IV, Prologue to the Commentary on the Song of Songs, Homily XXVII on Numbers* (New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press, 1979), p.206]. See also the references given at n.26 above.

²⁸ Simonetti, “Teologia Trinitaria”, p. 284 and n.45. Cf. *Comm. in Rom.* 6.7 (*PG* 14.1076B): “The Spirit himself is in the law and in the gospel; he is ever with the Father and the Son; like the Father and the Son he always is, and was, and will be” (trans. Bettenson, *Fathers*, p.227).

²⁹ F.H. Kettler, “Origenes”, *RGG*, IV (1960), 1696.

for Origen, since he held also to the datum that God was one and uncompounded. Origen solved this dilemma by declaring that God the Father was God in the proper sense of the term,³⁰ and thus placed the Son and the Spirit on a level subordinate to the Father. *Jo.* 13.25 contains a clear affirmation of this subordination. It states:³¹

We are convinced by the Saviour's statement 'the Father who sent me is greater than I' [*Jn* 14:28]. For this reason he did not bear to accept the appellation 'good' in its proper sense of 'true and perfect', when it was bestowed on him, but he offered it up gratefully to the Father with censure for the one who exceedingly praises the Son. [Thus] we say that the Saviour, and the Holy Spirit, transcend all the creatures, not by degree but by a transcendence beyond measure. But he [the Son, like the Holy Spirit] is transcended by the Father as much as, or even more than he and the Holy Spirit transcend the other creatures, even the highest.

This text emphasizes Origen's belief that, while the Son and the Spirit belong within the divine sphere, they are definitely inferior to the Father. While this inferiority may be only economic and not ontological,³² the impression is given that the Son and the Spirit are both "middle beings" whereas the Father alone is God in the proper sense of the term.³³

Origen holds it to be a fundamental given of Christian theology that there are three distinct persons within the Godhead.³⁴ The fact of the

³⁰ Cf. *Jo.* 2.2 (pp. 54.12-55.8; *PG* 14.108B-109B).

³¹ P.249.14-22; *PG* 14.441B-C. *Comm. in Mt.* 15.10 (pp. 375.20-376.13; *PG* 13.1280B-1281A) should be compared with this passage from *Jo.* There, Origen modifies the position taken in *Jo.* 13.25: the transcendence of the Son with regard to the created realm is greater than the transcendence of God the Father with regard to the Son. For a discussion of these two passages, see Daniélou, *Gospel Message*, pp. 383-384.

³² Crouzel ("Geist", col. 538) believes that the subordination of *Jo.* 13.25 concerns only the Father's transcendent glory, not his power.

³³ See the discussion by Pollard, *Johannine Christology*, pp. 91-105. Origen's writings so emphasize the mediatorial role of the Son in creation, revelation and salvation that for some modern commentators Origen's conception of God is primarily a binitarian one, in which there is no place for the Holy Spirit. See Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I, 626-627; Eugène de Faye, *Origène. Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux, 1928), III, 270-275; Hal Koch, "Origènes", *PWK*, XVIII/1 (1939), 1055; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 131-136; *idem*, *Gottes Geist*, pp. 136-138, 140-141. A more sympathetic judgment readily acknowledges the central role which the Son as mediator plays in Origen's thought, but contends that this should not be taken to imply that Origen's pneumatological thought is of no importance. For a recent attempt to demonstrate the importance of the Spirit for Origen, see Josep Rius-Camps, *El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, no. 188; Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1970). Cf. Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, trans. John Bowden (2nd ed.; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), I, 139-141. Despite Hauschild's belief that Origen's fundamental orientation is binitarian, he admits that when Origen's pneumatological statements are put together, they form an impressive picture. But, according to Hauschild, Origen fails to integrate his understanding of the Spirit into his theological system (*Gottes Geist*, p.149).

³⁴ Wiles, *Christian Doctrine*, pp. 72,124.

distinct existence of the Spirit is demonstrated in his "creation" by the Father through the mediation of the Son. This side of Origen's thought helped to provide the basis upon which the Cappadocian Fathers, a century later, asserted the co-equality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son, so that there were three co-equal persons in one Godhead. But Origen was compelled to assign to the Spirit a position subordinate to God the Father in order to reconcile the fact that there are three distinct persons within the Godhead with another deeply held belief, namely, that God is an uncompounded unity. This side of Origen's thought prepared the ground for the Pneumatomachi of the fourth century, who denied the divinity of the Spirit.

Origen died *ca.* 254, possibly as a result of the severe torture which he had received during the Decian persecution of 250. Despite the reactions against various aspects of his thought, reactions which began in his lifetime and gathered increasing momentum after his death, his theology of the Spirit, though clearly unsatisfactory, continued to dominate eastern pneumatological thought. This domination is well illustrated in the views which two later Alexandrian authors, Theognostus (head of the catechetical school, 247/248-282)³⁵ and Pierius (a presbyter under bishop Theonas, 281/282-300)³⁶ expressed about the Spirit. Even an author such as Dionysius of Alexandria (head of the catechetical school, 232-247/248; bishop, 247/248-264/265), who was not a strict disciple of Origen, shows the influence of his pneumatology.³⁷ The statement issued by the Council of Nicaea in 325, with its bare assertion "[we believe] in the Holy Spirit", did not change this situation. The extreme brevity of the statement is understandable in view of the fact that, as Basil of Caesarea later noted,³⁸ the Spirit's nature and status were simply not issues at the time. Consequently, for some years after Nicaea, the views of an Origenist like Eusebius of Caesarea were probably not atypical.³⁹ For Eusebius, the Spirit cannot be regarded as "God" because

³⁵ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 143-144. See also L.W. Barnard, "The Antecedents of Arius", *VChr*, XXIV (1970), 179-182. For a general discussion of Theognostus' debt to Origen, see L.B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria: Theognostus, Pierius and Peter* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1908), pp. 1-43.

³⁶ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 144-145. See also Barnard, "Antecedents", pp. 182-183. For a general discussion of Pierius' debt to Origen, see Radford, *Three Teachers*, pp. 44-57.

³⁷ See excursus I.

³⁸ See *epp.* 125.2-3 (II, 32.1-33.7; *PG* 32.548B-549A); 140.2 (II, 61-62; *PG* 32.588B-589A); 159.1-2 (II, 85.1-86.5; *PG* 32.620B-C); 258.2 (III, 101.12-102.20; *PG* 32.949B). Cf. Amphilochius, *ep.syn.* 2 (pp.219. 26-45; *PG* 39.96B-C). See also Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 165-166; Pelikan, *Catholic Tradition*, p. 211.

³⁹ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 16.

he has been created by the Son. However, since he transcends all other creatures in honour, glory and privileges he is to be included in the Trinity.⁴⁰ In fact, the question of the Spirit's nature and status did not become a burning issue for another thirty years. But when it did so, with the appearance of the Tropici in Egypt at the end of the fifties, the question was taken up with a passion, thrashed out and resolved within less than a quarter of a century. Undoubtedly, the most prominent figures in this resolution were Athanasius of Alexandria and Basil of Caesarea, both of whom were indebted to the trail-blazing of Origen.⁴¹ Neither of them lived to see the consummation of their labours in the expansion of the third article of the Nicene creed at the Council of Constantinople in 381. But Athanasius' letters to Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, and Basil's treatise on the Holy Spirit for his disciple Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, provided the foundation and immediate inspiration for this expansion, which brought the battle over trinitarian doctrine to a close.

2. Athanasius and the *Pneumatomachi* of Thmuis

The assassination of Constans, the ruler of the western Roman Empire, during the revolt of the Frankish general Magnentius in 350,⁴² triggered a series of events that culminated in the third exile of Athanasius, "the pillar of the Church"⁴³ and the foremost opponent of Arianism in the east. Constantius II, the brother of Constans and augustus of the east, moved against Magnentius in 352-353, and in a series of victories decisively crushed the armies of the rebel. Constantius, now firmly established as the sole ruler of the empire, soon returned to his former policy of open support for the Arian cause.⁴⁴ The western bishops, with a few excep-

⁴⁰ *E.th.* 3.5 (pp. 162.27-163.5; *PG* 24.1012B-C); 3.6 (pp. 163.30164.20; *PG* 24.1013B-D). See also Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 192-199; Laminski *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 14-16.

⁴¹ For a discussion of Athanasius' relationship to Origen, see Saake, "Notion de la Trinité", pp. 295-304. For a general discussion of Basil's debt to Origen, see Jean Gribomont, "L'Origénisme de saint Basil", in *L'Homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac* (Théologie, vol. 56; Paris: Aubier, 1963), I, 281-294.

⁴² Socrates, *h.e.* 2.25 (*PG* 67.265A-B); Sozomen, *h.e.* 4.1.1-3 (p.140.315; *PG* 67.1112B).

⁴³ ὁ στῦλος τῆς ἐκκλησίας; Gregory of Nazianzus, *or.* 21.26 (p.164.1-2; *PG* 35.1112B).

⁴⁴ Socrates, *h.e.* 2.26 (*PG* 67.268A-269A); Sozomen, *h.e.* 4.2.1 (p.140.16-18; *PG* 67.1113A). In 339, Athanasius had been ousted by Gregory, an Arian from Cappadocia, who had the favour of Constantius [Socrates, *h.e.* 2.11 (*PG* 67.205A-B); Sozomen, *h.e.* 3.6.4-11 (pp. 108.3-109.2; *PG* 67.1045D-1048C)]. During the exile which followed, Athanasius secured the support and friendship of Constans, who, after 340, was the augustus of the west. Constans was the chief initiator of the Council of Serdica, where an attempt was made to reconcile the west, which supported Athanasius, and the east, which supported the Arian Eusebius of Nicomedia. Despite the schism that resulted from the failure of this council to resolve the differences between the two sides [see Socrates, *h.e.* 2.20 (*PG* 67.233B-237C); H.M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900), pp.

tions, were compelled to condemn the bishop of Alexandria. This condemnation prevented any attempt by Athanasius to find a haven in the west, as he had done during two previous exiles.⁴⁵

Yet, Athanasius refused to leave his see until the arrival of some of Constantius' legions forced him to do so in 356.⁴⁶ Athanasius hid in the suburbs of Alexandria for a brief period,⁴⁷ and eventually retreated to the desert where he found refuge among the monks of Nitria and the lower Thebaid.⁴⁸ While he was in the desert Athanasius received a letter from his friend, Serapion, the bishop of Thmuis,⁴⁹ informing him of a group of

124-128; Hans Lietzmann, *From Constantine to Julian*, trans. B.L. Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1960), pp. 199-206], Constans continued to urge his brother to recall Athanasius. In the autumn of 344, Constantius issued a decree reinstating some of the clergy who supported Athanasius (Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. xlvii; Lietzmann, *From Constantine to Julian*, p. 207). In 345, after the death of Gregory, Athanasius was invited to return. Only after Constantius had written several times, however, did Athanasius accept [Socrates, *h.e.* 2.23 (PG 67.248A-261A); Sozomen, *h.e.* 3.20.1-3 (pp. 133.29-134.11; PG 67. 1100A-B)]. Yet, after Constans' death there was nothing to hinder Constantius' return to his former position with regard to Athanasius.

⁴⁵ Athanasius' first exile, from 335 to 337, was spent at Trier in northern Gaul [Socrates, *h.e.* 1.35 (PG 67.169C-172A); Sozomen, *h.e.* 2.28.14 (p.93.10-13; PG 67.1017A); see also N.H. Baynes, "Athanasiana", *JEA*, XI (1925), 65-69]. During his second exile, from 339 to 346 (see n.44 above), Athanasius stayed for the most part at Rome. On the importance of these sojourns in the west for the spread of ascetic theology, see Rudolf Lorenz, "Die Anfänge des abendländischen Mönchtums im 4.Jahrhundert", *ZKG*, LXXVII (1966), 2-16, *passim*; Philip Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority and the Church: In the Age of Jerome and Cassian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 81-83.

⁴⁶ Athanasius, *fug.* 24 (pp. 84.4-85.4; PG 25.673C-676B); *h. Ar.* 81 (pp. 228.29-230.20; PG 25.792C-796B); Sozomen, *h.e.* 4.9.8-10 (pp. 149.17-150.5; PG 67.1129C-1132B); Martin Tetz, "Athanasius von Alexandrien", *TRE*, IV (1979), 340. On Athanasius' stormy relationship with Constantius, see the recent monographs by Richard Klein, *Constantius II und die christliche Kirche* (Impulse der Forschung, vol. 26; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977); Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1993). Cf. also Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* 15.7.10 (p.164): "Constantius...was always hostile to Athanasius" [trans. J.C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus* (The Loeb Classical Library, no. 300; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press/London: William Heinemann, 1963), p. 165].

⁴⁷ Henry Burgess, trans., *The Festal Epistles of S. Athanasius* (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854), p.xxii. On the chronological questions with regard to this event, see Martin Tetz, "Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien", *ZKG*, XC (1979), 317.

⁴⁸ Sozomen, *h.e.* 4.30.1 (p. 187.7; PG 67.1205C). Sozomen [*h.e.* 4.9.10-10.8 (pp. 150.1 - 151.16; PG 67.1132A-1133C)] relates that Athanasius was able to evade capture because he had been given the gift of prophecy. Cf. also Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* 15.7.8(p.162): "It was reported that, being highly skilled in interpretation of prophetic lots or of the omens indicated by birds, he [Athanasius] had sometimes foretold future events" (trans. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, p. 163).

⁴⁹ On the life of Serapion of Thmuis see Joseph Lebon, trans. *Athanase d'Alexandrie: Lettres à Serapion sur la divinité du Saint-Esprit* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 15; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1947), pp.12-16; Heinrich Dörrie, "Serapion von Thmuis", *PWK*, Suppl. VIII (1956), 1260-1267; Quasten, *Patrology*, III, 80-85. On Serapion's view of the Holy Spirit, see Dörrie, "Serapion", cols. 1263-1264; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 33, n. 29; Helmut Saake, "Das Präskript zum ersten Serapionsbriefe des Athanasius von Alexandria als pneumatologisches Programm", *VChr*, XXVI (1972), 197, nn. 69,70.

Christians in Thmuis who held derogatory views of the Holy Spirit. Athanasius' response to the teaching of this group, whom he called "Tropici",⁵⁰ is found in *ep. Serap.* 1-4.7, written in 358-359.⁵¹

These letters provide a glimpse of the first group to whom the name "Pneumatomachi" may be properly given.⁵² It is only a glimpse since it appears that Athanasius had no immediate knowledge of the Pneumatomachi about whom Serapion had written him, nor did he have access to their

⁵⁰ It is clear that the epithet "Tropici" (τροπικοί) is not a neologism coined by Athanasius (*pace* Lebon, *Lettres*, p. 41), for he introduces it quite abruptly [see *ep. Serap.* 1.10 (PG 26.556B)], with the obvious assumption that Serapion is familiar with it (Shapland, *Letters*, pp.27; 85,n.9). On the basis of Athanasius' ironical etymology in *ep. Serap.*1.10, Saake believes that the term came out of the circle around Serapion, or may have been created by Serapion himself ("Pneumatologisches Programm", p. 191, n.18). However, a close examination of the context in which the term "Tropici" occurs in *ep. Serap.* 1.10 simply reveals that the term was well-known to Serapion.

The term occurs five times in the first letter to Serapion [1.10 (PG 26.556B); 1.17 (PG 26.572B); 1.21 (PG 26.580D); 1.30 (PG 26.600A); 1.32 (PG 26.605A); see Guido Müller, *Lexicon Athanasianum* (Berlin: Gruyter & Co., 1952), col. 1453]. Only Ps.-Athanasius (*haer.* 5 (PG 28.509D)), among later orthodox writers, uses the term as an epithet for their Pneumatomachian opponents (see Shapland, *Letters*, p.27). Athanasius' use of the term is somewhat derogatory [Friedrich Loofs, "Macedonianism", *ERE*, VIII (1916), 227; Alasdair Heron, "Zur Theologie der 'Tropici' in den Serapionbriefen des Athanasius", *Ky*, XIV (1974), 4]. The term is derived from the word τροπικός, which in the Alexandrian tradition was used to describe a method of exegesis scarcely distinguishable from the allegorical method [Louis Doutreleau, trans., *Didyme l'Aveugle: Sur Zacharie* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 83; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1962), I, 58-59; W.A. Bienert, "Allegoria" und "Anagoge" bei Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandria (Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 13; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1972), pp. 53, 78, 101, 104-105, 108]. However, Athanasius' use of this term with reference to the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis is not aimed at a method of exegesis peculiar to them, for Athanasius himself can make use of the "tropical" or allegorical method of interpretation when the need arises [Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 31-32; 76, n.2]. For instance, in his refutation of his opponents' interpretation of Am 4:13, he employs both the literal and tropical methods of exegesis [*ep. Serap.* 1.3-10 (PG 26.536A-556B); see pp. 67-68, n. 60]. Rather, Athanasius calls his opponents "Tropici" because their interpretations distort the Scriptural witness to Christ and to his Spirit. On the deficient exegesis of the Tropici, see T.E. Pollard, "The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy", *BJRL*, XLI (1958-1959), 417-418; Hauschild "Pneumatomachen", pp. 26-27; Heron, "Theologie", pp. 3-24, *passim*.

⁵¹ On the date of the letters, see pp. 59 and 59-60, n.5.

⁵² Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 16, 177. There were, of course, forerunners to the Pneumatomachi (see Kretschmar, *Studien*, pp. 2-9; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 7-29), but Athanasius' opponents in Egypt were the first for whom the divinity of the Spirit became a live issue. Before this time the divinity of the Son had been the central issue. Thus, many who denied the divinity of the Son, denied the divinity of the Spirit simply as a matter of course. For the various interpretations with regard to the origin of the pneumatology of the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis, see Loofs, "Macedonianism", pp. 228-229; Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 26-34; Peter Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", *PWK*, XXI/I (1951), 1078-1080; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 34, 54, 87-88, 178-179; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 27-29, 176-191; A.M. Ritter, "Literarische Berichte und Anzeigen: W.-D. Hauschild: Die Pneumatomachen. Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts", *ZKG*, LXXX (1969), 402-403; Heron, "Theologie" pp. 3-24.

writings.⁵³ Athanasius was thus dependent on Serapion's reports for his knowledge of the Pneumatomachi at Thmuis. Since this is the case, it cannot be known how fully or accurately Serapion had informed Athanasius. It must be recognized therefore that some of the statements concerning the pneumatology and the exegesis of the Tropicici may not be completely true to the position of Athanasius' opponents. Nonetheless, there are passages which can be considered authentic reports,⁵⁴ and the broad outline of the Pneumaomachian position contained in these letters is almost certainly true to the facts.⁵⁵

Serapion informed Athanasius that this group of Christians in the community of Thmuis were maintaining that the Holy Spirit is a creature (κτίσμα), albeit of angelic nature.⁵⁶ In his first response, *ep. Serap. 1*, Athanasius is insistent that the Holy Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ, cannot be a creature. The belief that the Spirit is a creature not only blasphemes the Son, but also destroys the Christian concept of God, for it makes the Trinity consist of Creator and creature. However, despite their blasphemy, Athanasius does not immediately brand his opponents as heretics nor does he cease all communication with them. Furthermore, since Serapion would not have written to Athanasius for advice if he and the Nicene community at Thmuis were convinced that the Tropicici were heretics, it can be assumed that, at this point, there was a dialogue

⁵³ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 16-17; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p.30. Meinhold ("Pneumatomachoi", col. 1090) is of the opinion that Serapion had sent Athanasius a copy of certain extracts from a Pneumatomachian tract. In support of this, Meinhold cites *ep. Serap. 4.1* (PG 26.637C): οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται. But Meinhold has failed to observe the relationship between this phrase and its context. The sentence in which the phrase is found is as follows: "Then, as you write, they add, if the Spirit 'shall take of' the Son (ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λήψεται) and is given from him (for so it is written) they go on directly, then the Father is a grandfather and the Spirit is his grandson" [(PG 26.637C)]. The phrase in question clearly has a parenthetical function. There are two possible explanations of this function. 1) Either it is a part of the Pneumatomachian argument about which Serapion is informing Athanasius. If this is the case, the Pneumatomachi are using Jn 16:14 to support their statement that if the Spirit is "of the Son", then he must be the grandson of the Father. 2) Or else, Athanasius is admitting that the phrase ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λήψεται is Scriptural in that it comes from Jn 16:14 (ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται). In this case, Athanasius will go on to show how his opponents have misunderstood the Scriptures. The former is more likely. In either case, οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται cannot be used to support the thesis that Athanasius had direct access to a Pneumatomachian tract. As Laminski (*Der Heilige Geist*, p.30, n.6) shows, Athanasius consistently introduces his opponents' arguments with "as they think" or "as they say", never "as they write".

⁵⁴ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p.17.

⁵⁵ Heron, "Theologie", p.4.

⁵⁶ *Ep. Serap. 1.1* (PG 26.529A-532A): "You write, beloved and truly longed for, yourself also in distress, that certain persons, having forsaken the Arians on account of their blasphemy against the Son of God, yet oppose the Holy Spirit, saying that he is not only a creature, but actually one of the ministering spirits, and differs from the angels only in degree" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 59-60). Cf. *ep. Serap. 1.10* (PG 26.556C).

between the Nicene community and the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis.⁵⁷ Athanasius, in his first two letters to Serapion, enters into that dialogue with a view not only of showing the Tropici their doctrinal error, but also of effecting a change of mind.

But as for us, speak we must, that we may not neglect to answer their impiety, and that they may perhaps even repent.⁵⁸

But as for those who speak evil of the Spirit and call him a creature, if what we have said, does not make them repent, then may what we are about to say overwhelm them with shame.⁵⁹

Although Athanasius says that one ought to avoid all discussion with the Tropici and to shun them as heretics, in accordance with Paul's advice in Tit 3:10,⁶⁰ he himself continues in his attempt to win them over to his side.⁶¹

However, in the final letter, Athanasius gives Serapion definite instructions to break off relations with those who blaspheme the Holy Spirit.⁶² The Apostle Paul's admonition in Tit 3:10 is indeed appropriate for them:⁶³

'A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted and sins, self-condemned.' For having a warped mind, he does not inquire that he may hear and be persuaded, or that he may learn and repent, but just because of those whom he has deceived; lest, keeping silent, he should be condemned by them also.

Athanasius therefore concludes:⁶⁴

It is not safe to make any further answer to the effrontery of the heretics, for that is to oppose the Apostle's injunction [Tit 3:10]. It is good rather to give the counsel he demanded.

The Tropici are henceforth to be regarded as heretics⁶⁵ and pagans.⁶⁶

The emperor Constantius died in 361, and the new ruler, Julian, although an apostate, permitted all those bishops exiled by Constantius, including Athanasius, to return to their respective sees.⁶⁷ Yet, a few

⁵⁷ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp.27-28.

⁵⁸ *Ep. Serap.* 2.7 (PG 26.620B). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 163.

⁵⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 3.7 (PG 26.636D). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 177. Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.21 (PG 26.581A): "Perhaps they may be put to shame when they realize how far the blasphemous words they have devised are out of harmony with the divine oracles" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 120).

⁶⁰ *Ep. Serap.* 1.15 (PG 26.568A).

⁶¹ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 28-29; Heron, "Theologie", p.4.

⁶² *Ep. Serap.* 4.6 (PG 26.648A). See also Shapland, *Letters*, p. 188, n.10.

⁶³ *Ep. Serap.* 4.1 (PG 26.637A-B). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 179.

⁶⁴ *Ep. Serap.* 4.6 (PG 26.648A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 188.

⁶⁵ *Ep. Serap.* 4.1 (PG 26.637A).

⁶⁶ *Ep. Serap.* 4.2 (PG 26.640A).

⁶⁷ Sozomen, *h.e.* 5.5.1, 6-7 (pp. 198.16-199.1, 199.21-200.8; PG 67.1225C, 1227B-C).

months later Athanasius was to be banished again, this time, for being “an enemy of the gods”,⁶⁸ a busybody and a rogue.⁶⁹ Nonetheless, Athanasius put his few months in Alexandria to good use. He called a synod to resolve the differences that lay between the western and eastern supporters of the Nicene creed.⁷⁰ Among the questions on the agenda was that of the Holy Spirit. The relevant passage from the text sent by this synod to the Antiochenes makes the following declaration:⁷¹

Therefore all who desire peace with us [ought] ...to anathematize the Arian heresy, to confess the faith that was confessed by the Holy Fathers at Nicaea, and also to anathematize those who say the Holy Spirit is a creature and separate him from the being (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας) of Christ. For a true departure from the loathsome heresy of the Arians is this: [a refusal] to divide the Holy Trinity, or to say that any member of it is a creature. For those who pretend to profess the faith confessed at Nicaea, but who dare to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, do nothing more than deny the Arian heresy in words, while they hold it fast in thought.

Those concepts which Athanasius had worked out in the correspondence with Serapion are evident in these statements: the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, and so, belongs to the Godhead;⁷² the Spirit, as such, cannot be a creature;⁷³ and thus, the Trinity is indivisible.⁷⁴ Furthermore, practical expression is given to the judgment of *ep. Serap.* 4.1-7 by the decision expressed in *tom.* 3, to have no further fellowship with those who considered the Holy Spirit a creature and who separated him from the Godhead.⁷⁵

⁶⁸ Julian, *ep.* 112 (p.192.5-20). It is in this letter that Julian expresses his overall opinion of Athanasius by the strong epithet “the disgusting fellow” (ὁ μισαρός). See also C.B. Armstrong, “The Synod of Alexandria and the Schism at Antioch in A.D.362”, *JTS*, XXII (1921), 352-355; James Breckenridge, “Julian and Athanasius”, *Th*, LXXVI (1973), 73-81.

⁶⁹ Julian, *ep.* 111 (pp. 191.4-192.2).

⁷⁰ Socrates, *h.e.* 3.7 (PG 667.389A-392A); Sozomen, *h.e.* 5.12.3-5 (p.211.8-20; PG 67.1252A-B). See also Gwatkin, *Studies*, pp. 209-211.

⁷¹ *Tom.* 3 (PG 26.797C-800A). Cf. *tom.* 5 (PG 26.801B): the Spirit is not “a creature, nor of a different nature (ζέον), but proper to and indivisible from the being of the Son and the Father”. See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 120-121; Martin Tetz, “Über nikäische Orthodoxie”, *ZNTW*, LXVI (1975), 200-201.

⁷² Cf., e.g., *ep. Serap.* 1.25 (PG 26.588C-589C).

⁷³ Cf., e.g., *ep. Serap.* 1.21-27 (PG 26.581A-593C), *passim*.

⁷⁴ Cf., e.g., *ep. Serap.* 1.2 (PG 26.532B-533C); 1.29 (PG 26.596C-597B).

⁷⁵ Meinhold, “Pneumatomachoi”, cols. 1079-1080. There are no further references to the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis in Athanasius’ later writings. However, with regard to other Pneumatomachi, Laminski (*Der Heilige Geist*, pp.123-124) makes the following suggestion. *Ep. Max.* 5 (PG 26.1089C-D) contains Athanasius’ reaction to Liberius’ acceptance of the Homoiousian delegation led by Eustathius of Sebaste to Rome in 366. The text reads as follows: “Let what was confessed by the Fathers at Nicaea be held fast; for that is orthodox and sufficient to overthrow all of the most impious heresies (πᾶσαν ἀσεβεσάτην αἵρεσιν), especially that of the Arians, which blasphemes the Word of God, and perforce speaks irreverently of his Holy Spirit.” On Athanasius’ view of Eustathius as a supporter of Arian impiety, see *ep. Aeg. Lib.* 7 (PG 26.553A-B); *h.Ar.* 4 (pp. 184.31-185.9; PG 25.697D-700A).

Athanasius' letters to Serapion and the statement issued by the Synod of Alexandria over which he presided in 362 quickly became the standard by which orthodoxy with regard to the Holy Spirit was judged in the next two decades. Thus, despite the fact that the controversy over the divinity of the Spirit intensified only after the death of Athanasius in 373, it was his doctrine of the Spirit which laid the foundation for the orthodox victory achieved at the Council of Constantinople in 381.⁷⁶

3. Basil and the *Pneumatomachi* of Sebaste

When the emperor Valens, the protector of the Arians, was about to visit Caesarea in October 365, the bishop of that city, Eusebius, quickly recalled his presbyter, Basil, from the latter's Pontic retreat in order that the Nicene party might have the aid of one of its strongest champions. Basil had gone to his retreat at Annesoi shortly after his ordination in 364 due to a conflict between himself and Eusebius which threatened to plunge the church of Caesarea into an internal schism.⁷⁷ But now Basil was desperately needed to resist Valens' attempt to subdue the orthodox believers in Cappadocia. Although the threat never materialized,⁷⁸ Basil remained at Caesarea. From this point on, Basil directed much of his energy towards the renewal of the spiritual and social life of the church of Caesarea: he organized the poor, reformed the clergy, and especially concentrated on integrating the ascetic life into the church.⁷⁹ Basil's conversion to the ascetic life in 356⁸⁰ had introduced him to a widespread

⁷⁶ See Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 220-221; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 124-125, 172-176.

⁷⁷ P.J. Fedwick, *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea* (Studies and Texts, no. 45; Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979), pp. 14, 140, 141. On the causes of the quarrel, see Gregory of Nazianzus, *or.* 43.28 (PG 36.533C-536A). On Gregory's role as mediator between Basil and Eusebius, see his *epp.* 16.19 (pp. 17.20-20.13; PG 37.49B-53B); *or.* 43.31 (PG 36.540A). See further Paul Gallay, *La Vie de saint Grégoire de Nazainze* (Lyon: Emmanuel Vitte, 1943), pp. 85-87.

⁷⁸ Gwatkin, *Studies*, p. 241; G.F. Reilly, *Imperium and Sacerdotium According to St. Basil the Great* (The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, no. 7; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945), pp. 50-51.

⁷⁹ Jackson, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. xxi; W.-D. Hauschild, "Basilius von Caesarea", *TRE*, V (1980), 304.

⁸⁰ *Ep.* 223.2 (III, 10.1-10; PG 32.824A-B): "I spent much time in vanity and wasted nearly all of my youth in the vain labour which occupied me in the acquisition of the teachings of that wisdom which God has made foolish. Then at last, as if roused from a deep sleep, I looked at the wonderful light of the truth of the Gospel, and I perceived the worthlessness of the wisdom 'of the rulers of this age, who are doomed to destruction' [1 Cor 2:6]. After I had mourned deeply for my miserable life I prayed that guidance be given to me for my introduction to the precepts of piety". For Basil, asceticism never entailed a flight from the world; rather, his conception of the ascetic life is characterized by a spirit of

movement, of which one of the characteristics was a renewal of the charismatic life which had been common in the apostolic church.⁸¹ His experience of the Spirit in the ascetic life was certainly a key factor in his growing concern with the dogmatic problem of the Holy Spirit.⁸²

Already, in 364, Basil had given a brief explication of his views on the doctrine of the Spirit in *Eun.* 3, the final book of a three-volume apologetic against the Anomoean leader Eunomius.⁸³ Despite the fact

self-denial, a rejection of worldliness, and a devotion to God through one's work in society (Hauschild, "Basilius", p. 302). On the important role played by Eustathius of Sebaste in Basil's theology of the ascetic life, see n.87 below.

⁸¹ W.K.L. Clarke, *The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil* (London: S.P.C.K., 1925), pp. 42-46; Eric Osborn, *Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp. 85-86. For a valuable correction of Clarke's thought, see Pierre Humbertclaude, *La Doctrine ascétique de saint Basil de Césarée* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils, 1932), pp. 313-320. The fact of Basil's (and many of his contemporaries') living experience of the Spirit is overlooked by those scholars who regard him (and the other theologians of his day) as simply a Greek philosopher in ecclesiastical garb. A typical statement of this point of view is given by G.F. Nuttall [*The Holy Spirit and Ourselves* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947), p.76]: "Within a century or two [after the Apostle Paul] the place of the Spirit in early Christian life was almost wholly forgotten. The Spirit became hardly more than a *term* to be fitted into an intellectual framework, so far as Greek thinking would permit this." Cf. a similar statement in R.P.C. Hanson, *God: Creator Saviour Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1960), p.79.

⁸² Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 149-156, 159-161; *idem*, "Basilius und das Dogma vom Der Heilige Geist" in his *Wort und Stunde* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), I, 131, 132, 136; R.L. Wilken, "The Spirit of Holiness: Basil of Caesarea and Early Christian Spirituality", *Wo*, XLII (1968), 79. P.B.T. Bilaniuk ["The Monk as Pneumatophor in the Writings of St. Basil the Great", *Di*, XV (1980), 58] writes that Basil was "a pneumatic optimist, who believed in the powerful activity of the Holy Spirit, who even admitted extraordinary signs and pneumatic events, but who would reject all immoderate enthusiasm...".

⁸³ On the date, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 8, n.1; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 5, 140. For a critical assessment of *Eun.* 3, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 8-14, 128-129; B.C. Barmann, "The Cappadocian Triumph over Arianism" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1966), pp. 115-120. Basil's own view of the work in *Eun.* 1-3 is found in *ep.* 20 (I, 51.25-33; *PG* 32.285B-C): "I have also sent you the books against Eunomius; whether they must be called child's play or something a little more serious, I leave you to judge. I think you no longer need them for yourself, but I expect they will be a significant weapon for you against the perverse [heretics] whom you meet. I do not trust so much in the power of my treatise, but I know perfectly well that you are able to proceed from meagre resources to many discoveries. But if any statement appears weaker to you than it ought to be, do not hesitate to point it out". See also the reference to *Eun.* 3 in *ep.* 25.2 (I, 63.18-24; *PG* 32.301A), which was written in 368.

Another treatise containing views on the Spirit is *DS*, a Plotinian cento. This work is sometimes placed among Basil's early works, but it should not be considered authentic. Most recently Hans Dehnhard [*Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin* (Patristische Texte und Studien, vol.3; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1964), pp. 14-67] has argued that *DS* is indeed an authentic work of Basil. Dehnhard dates it ten to fifteen years prior to *Spir.*, i.e. around 360-365 (*Problem*, p.67). A large number of scholars agree with Dehnhard's arguments for the authenticity of this work: see Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, "Reviews: *Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin: Quellenuntersuchungen zu seinen Schriften De Spiritu Sancto*. By Hans Dehnhard" *JTS*, n.s., XVI (1965), 196-199; Jean Daniélou, "Bulletin d'histoire des origines chrétiennes: Hans Dehnhard. *Das Problem der*

that Basil considered this work “child’s play”,⁸⁴ some of the themes which will characterize his mature thought on the Spirit are already in evidence here: for instance, the refusal to place the Spirit among the creatures, the proof of the Spirit’s divine nature from the names and activities ascribed to him in the Scriptures, the further argument from baptism as the initiation of participation in the divine life through the Spirit, and the emphasis on the limits of human knowledge with regard to the Holy Spirit.⁸⁵ The maturation of his thought however came only through conflict. The Pneumatomachian controversy, which dominated much of Basil’s episcopacy, compelled Basil to reflect more deeply than ever before on the nature of the Spirit whom he so richly experienced in the ascetic life. This controversy also destroyed a friendship which Basil had long treasured. Eustathius of Sebaste, a pioneer in Anatolian asceti-

Abhängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin”, *RSR*, LII (1965), 157-161; Benoît Pruche, *Basile de Césarée: Sur le Saint-Esprit* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 17; 2nd.ed.; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968), p. 169; cf. *ibid.*, p. 247; R.P.C. Hanson, “Basil’s Doctrine of Tradition in Relation to the Holy Spirit”, *VChr*, XXII (1968), 248. However, Jean Gribomont [“Comptes rendus: Hans Dehnhard. *Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin. Quellenuntersuchungen zu seinen Schriften ‘De Spiritu Sancto’*” *RHE*, LX (1965), 487-492; “Intransigence and Irenicism in Saint Basil’s ‘De Spiritu Sancto’”, *WS*, I (1979) 135-136, n.67; cf. however, his “Basil, St”, *NCE*, I (1967), 144] has argued against the Basilian authorship of *DS*. The external attestation of *DS* as a work from Basil’s hand is weak (“Comptes rendus”, pp. 488-489). Gribomont has also noted that those sections of *DS* where Plotinus is not followed are decidedly non-Basilian in character (*ibid.*, p.491). Furthermore, certain Biblical citations in *DS* are accorded great importance (e.g., Is 21:12; Mk 9:24), yet they hardly reappear in Basil’s later work (*ibid.*, p. 492). Gribomont thus concludes that *DS* does indeed come from a Cappadocian milieu (for it is dependent on Gregory Thaumaturgus and has affinities with Basil’s own work), but he is very hesitant to ascribe its authorship to Basil (*ibid.*, p. 492). J.M. Rist [“Basil’s ‘Neoplatonism’: Its Background and Nature” in P.J.Fedwick, ed., *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981), pp. 190-220] also presents a very strong case against the Basilian authorship of *DS*. First, Rist notes that *DS* has particularly studied one text of Plotinus, *Enn.* 5.1, and cited a large section of it. Yet, Rist believes that it is highly unlikely that Basil would have encountered Plotinus before his episcopate. It is also strange that such a devotion to *Enn.* 5.1, as is displayed in *DS*, does not appear in any of Basil’s contemporary works (*ibid.*, p. 194). Second, Rist takes note of the weak manuscript evidence for Basil’s authorship of *DS*, which Gribomont also has mentioned (*ibid.*, p. 194). Furthermore, the fact that Basil may have used *DS* in the compilation of *Spir.*, especially with regard to chap. 9, as Dehnhard argues (*Problem*, pp. 32-66) and which Rist disputes (“Basil’s ‘Neoplatonism’”, pp. 195-202), does not necessarily mean that Basil wrote *DS* (*ibid.*, p.195). Finally, Rist criticizes Dehnhard’s implication that because *DS* is dependent on Gregory Thaumaturgus, then Basil must be its author, since Basil also was indebted to the Origenist tradition of Cappadocia, in which Gregory Thaumaturgus held a central place (*ibid.*, p. 195). This shows only that *DS* stems from a Cappadocian milieu. Rist concludes that *DS* may very well have been written by Basil’s brother, Gregory of Nyssa (*ibid.*, p.218). Although this conclusion may be untenable, his arguments against the Basilian authorship of *DS* remain intact.

⁸⁴ *Ep.* 20 (I, 51.25-26; *PG* 32.285B). See n.83 above.

⁸⁵ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 13.

cism⁸⁶ and Basil's acknowledged master in the ascetic life,⁸⁷ became, in

⁸⁶ Sozomen, *h.e.* 3.14.31-37 (pp.123.10-124.20; *PG* 67.1077C-1081B); David Amand, *L'Ascèse monastique de saint Basile* (Maredsous: Éditions de Maredsous, 1948), p. 53; Jean Gribomont, "Eustathe de Sébaste", *DSP*, IV/2 (1961), 1708 [hereafter cited as "Eustathe de Sébaste"]; *idem*, "Eustathe de Sébaste", *DHGE*, XVI (1967), 26-27 [hereafter cited as "Eustathe"]. Eustathius was also a key figure in the Homoiousian party, which emerged at the Synod of Ancyra (358), under the leadership of Basil of Ancyra [Epiphanius, *haer.* 73.2.1-12 (pp.268.30-271.6; *PG* 42.404A-408A)]. He was deposed by the Homoean synod of Constantinople in 360, and his see given to Meletius, who was later a close friend of Basil. Despite his deposition, Eustathius was prominent in the re-affirmation of the Homoiousian position during the reigns of Julian and Jovian. Especially significant in this regard was the Synod of Lampascus, held in the autumn of 364, where the Homoiousians declared that the Son is similar in being (ὁμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν) with the Father. When the question of the Holy Spirit was raised, Eustathius uttered that celebrated dictum: "I neither choose to name the Holy Spirit God nor dare to call him a creature" [Socrates, *h.e.* 2.45 (*PG* 67.360A-B)]. Eustathius cherished this *via media* far into the 370s [see Basil, *ep.*128 (II,38.13-17; *PG* 32.536B-C)].

However, this reluctance to commit himself to a position with respect to the nature of the Spirit did not stem from Eustathius' indifference to the Holy Spirit. He was quite prepared to give honour to the Spirit, but not on a level equal to the glorification of the Father and the Son [*Spir.* 24.55 (p.111.1-2; *PG* 32.172A); see also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p.86]. Eustathius simply refused to take this last step. The reasons for this are to some extent obscure. Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", pp. 49-50, 55-56, 218-224) cites especially his biblicism and his charismatic experience of the Spirit as a gift. Eustathius, in his reflection upon the Scriptures, found only silence with respect to the Spirit's conglorification with the Father and the Son. At a deeper level, his personal experience of the Spirit as a gift, the means of sanctification within him, prevented Eustathius from conceiving of the Spirit as a "divine Other". Ritter ("Literarische Berichte", pp.404-406) is critical of both of these reasons. Basil, like Athanasius, was also biblicistic in his pneumatological formulations (on Athanasius' biblicism, see pp. 63-67; on that of Basil, pp.114-120). In actuality, for Eustathius, the silence of the Scriptures on the divinity of the Spirit was more of a weapon for defending his beliefs than a reason which gave rise to them.

Hauschild's second reason, Eustathius' experience of the Spirit, is supported in part by Hauschild's arguments for Eustathius' authorship of *bapt.* ("Pneumatomachen", pp. 220-224). Ritter however demonstrates that *bapt.* is not a work of Eustathius ["Literarische Berichte", pp. 404-406; on the question of *bapt.*'s authorship, see also Jean Gribomont, *Histoire du texte des Ascétiques de S. Basile* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 32; Louvain: Publications Universitaires/Institut Orientaliste, 1953), pp. 306-308; A.J.M. Davids, "On Ps.- Basil, *De baptismo* I", *SP*, XIV (1976), 302-306; Umberto Neri, trans., *Basilio de Cesarea, Il battesimo* (Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1976), pp. 23-53]. Thus, Ritter concludes that, simply on the basis of Eustathius' statements in *Spir.* 10-27, it cannot be argued that Eustathius' asceticism was the soil of his pneumatology. Ritter sees the relationship between his asceticism and his pneumatology as a reciprocal one, wherein neither element can be viewed as the ground of the other ("Literarische Berichte", p. 406). For further discussion of Eustathius' doctrinal position, see Gwatkin, *Studies*, pp. 277-278; Amand, *Ascèse*, p. 55 and n.53; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, *passim*; Gribomont, "Eustathe de Sébaste", cols. 1709-1712; *idem*, "Intransigence", p. 122.

⁸⁷ *Ep.* 223.3 (III,11.1-3, 11-12; *PG* 32.824D-825A): "...when I saw certain men in my homeland endeavouring to imitate their deeds [those of the ascetics of Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia], I thought that I had found some help for my own salvation, ...on account of the extraordinary nature of their way of life, I was zealous in their regard". See W.K.L. Clarke, *St. Basil the Great. A Study in Monasticism* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1913), p.47, n.4: "Basil was originally Eustathius' disciple...". See also Amand, *Ascèse*, pp. 52-61; Jean Gribomont, "Saint Basile" in *Théologie de la vie monastique. Études sur la tradition patristique* (Théologie, vol. 49; Paris: Aubier, 1961), pp. 99-100, 106, 111;

the course of the conflict, Basil's embittered opponent and the leader of the Pneumatomachi in northern Asia Minor.

Up until 372, nearly two years after Basil had been elected to succeed Eusebius, there was still little sign of this storm that was brewing beyond Basil's ken.⁸⁸ In the winter of 371-372, Valens renewed his attempts to impose Arianism on the orthodox bastion of Cappadocia.⁸⁹ Eustathius quickly sent one of his disciples, Eleusinius, to Basil to provide spiritual aid and to express his concern for Basil's safety.⁹⁰ Yet, in the conflict which ensued between the emperor and the bishop, Basil emerged the victor.⁹¹ The emperor even went so far as to grant land to Basil for a hospice which Basil desired to build.⁹² Eustathius again showed his love for Basil by sending two of his disciples, Basil and Sophronius, to help

idem, "Esotérisme et tradition dans le *Traité du Saint-Esprit* de Saint Basile", *Oec*, II (1967), 29-30. Fedwick (*Charisma*, pp. 159-160) notes that Basil's debt to Eustathius was confined to the practice of the ascetic life, and did not encompass matters of faith. See also Gribomont, "Esotérisme", p. 30.

⁸⁸ Gribomont, "Esotérisme", p.33.

⁸⁹ Gwatkin, *Studies*, pp. 247-248; Reilly, *Imperium*, pp. 51-62. On Basil's attitude toward the civil power of the state, see also Gerhard May, "Basilius der Grosse und der Römische Staat" in Bernd Moeller and Gerhard Ruhbach, eds., *Bleibendes im Wandel der Kirchengeschichte. Kirchenhistorische Studien* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973], pp. 47-70; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 37-41.

⁹⁰ *Ep.* 79 (I, 180-181; *PG* 32.453C-D): "Even before I received your letter I knew the distress which you feel on behalf of every soul, especially on behalf of our Lowliness, because I have been exposed to this struggle. And when I received your letter from the most revered Eleusinius and saw his very presence I glorified God, who, through his spiritual aid, has graciously given to us such a comrade and supporter. And let it be known to your unsurpassable Piety that up till now some attacks have been made on us by the chief rulers. They were severe, for both the prefect and the chamberlain argued on behalf of our opponents from personal motives. But up to this time we have endured every attack steadfastly by the mercy of God, who graciously gives to us the assistance of the Spirit and through him strenghtens our weakness." Stanislas Giet [*Les Idées et l'action sociales de saint Basile* (Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1941), p.286, n.2] believes that neither this letter nor *ep.* 119 show any great love for Eustathius. The opening sentence, for Giet, is indicative of Basil's impatience with the indiscreet anxiety of Eustathius. Giet comments: "one has the impression that he [Basil] could do without such a patronage, which moreover was troublesome." The letter can be read this way, but only through the lens of the later enmity between Basil and Eustathius. Dörries (*De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 104) is more moderate in his assessment of *ep.* 79; yet, he too detects a concern of Basil for his relationship with Eustathius. Although such a concern is definitely present in *ep.* 119 (*ibid.*, p. 104), *ep.* 79 seems best interpreted as evidence of the warm friendship which existed between Basil and Eustathius before their break (see Loofs, *Eustathius*, p. 34; Gribomont, "Eustathe le Philosophe", pp. 115-116).

⁹¹ On this conflict, see Edmund Venables, "Basilius of Caesarea", *DCB*, I (1877), 288-290; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 37-41.

⁹² Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 104, 144.

in the erection of the hospice.⁹³ Also, in the spring of 372,⁹⁴ Basil edited a circular letter destined for the Western episcopate, appealing for their aid in seeking a solution to the schism which rent the orthodox community of Antioch.⁹⁵ The letter was co-signed by thirty-two bishops, including Eustathius.⁹⁶ Thus, at this point, there appeared to be dogmatic agreement between Basil and Eustathius.

The Eustathians in Basil's community at Caesarea however soon became a source of tension between Basil and Eustathius. Late in 372 the Eustathians, Basil and Sophronius, quit Caesarea and returned to Eustathius filled with slanders against Basil. *Ep.* 119,⁹⁷ which provides this information, does not specify the nature of the charges brought against Basil by Eustathius' disciples. They could have concerned doctrine; but they could equally well have stemmed from personal differences or clashes over ascetic practice.⁹⁸ Whatever their cause, Basil strove to prevent any separation between himself and Eustathius:

Your Intelligence should give some consideration as to how [these events] must be remedied. For the accusations concocted by Sophronius against us are not a foretaste of blessings, but a beginning of division and separation and an attempt to cool the love between us. [Therefore] we urge that he be restrained by your Mercy from this harmful attack. [Furthermore, we implore] your Charity to attempt rather to unite those parts which are torn asunder than to increase the separation along with those who are eager for a division.⁹⁹

The attacks by the Eustathian monks against Basil nevertheless continued unabated,¹⁰⁰ and Basil's fears for their friendship would prove to be well founded.

⁹³ See *ep.* 119 (II, 23-25; *PG* 32.536B-537B). Later, after his break with Eustathius in 375, Basil will write in *ep.* 223.3 (III, 11.18-20; *PG* 32.825B): "The guards and spies of our life were given to us under the pretence of assistance and affectionate communion." Cf. Reilly, *Imperium*, p. 70, n.85.

⁹⁴ Justin Taylor, "St. Basil the Great and Pope St. Damasus I", *DR*, XCI (1973), 195-197; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 109, 144.

⁹⁵ On this schism, see pp. 33-34.

⁹⁶ Gribomont ("Esoterisme", p.33) suggests that Eustathius' agreement may have been presumed indiscreetly. Yet, Gribomont ("Eustathe", col. 31; "Intransigence", p.123) follows Loofs (*Eustathius*, pp. 42-44, n.3; 44) and Hans Lietzmann [*Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule* (1904 ed.; rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1970), pp. 52-53] in maintaining Theodotus of Nicopolis, an orthodox zealot (see pp. 33-35), co-signed this letter with Eustathius, whom he considered to be a heretic only a couple of months later. This is highly unlikely. Theodotus' doubts must therefore date from the latter part of 372 and culminate in the momentous events of 373. See pp. 35-37. W.A. Jurgens ["A Letter of Meletius of Antioch", *HTR*, LIII (1960), 251-260] believes that *ep.* 92 was written by Meletius, not Basil.

⁹⁷ For 372 as the date of *ep.* 119, see Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 33-34; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 145.

⁹⁸ See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 104.

⁹⁹ *Ep.* 119 (II, 25.35-43; *PG* 32.537B).

¹⁰⁰ See *epp.* 128.1 (II, 37.1-15; *PG* 32.533C-556A); 244.2 (III, 74.375.13; *PG* 32.913A-

The presence of Pneumatomachi in the eastern provinces of Asia Minor shortly before Eustathius' leadership of their cause is well attested by *ep.* 113, 114 and 105.¹⁰¹ *Epp.* 113 and 114 are both written to the church at Tarsus, where, after the death of Silvanus, the bishop of Tarsus, in 369,¹⁰² certain Pneumatomachi emerged in the community, who were advocates of the belief that the Spirit is a creature. This disturbance polarized the rest of the community into two groups, "zealots" (to whom *ep.* 113 is written) and "moderates", led by Cyriacus (to whom *ep.* 114 is addressed).¹⁰³ In an attempt to prevent a schism, Basil exhorted both groups to accept those who confessed the Nicene Creed

B): "There has been nothing on our side from the beginning which could have been the cause, either small or great, of the disagreement; but men who hate us, for reasons which they themselves know (it is not necessary for me to say anything about them), were continually fabricating slanders. Once, and then a second time, we cleared ourselves [of these charges]. But there was no end to the matter and no advantage [to be gained] from a continual defence. For we lived far away, whereas those who were spreading the false reports were nearby, and able to overpower by their slanders against us a heart which was easily conquered and which had not learned to keep one ear unprejudiced with regard to one who was not present." Basil placed great value on hearing both sides of a matter before passing judgement. See *ep.* 24 (I, 61.40-43; *PG* 32.297C); 94 (I, 206.58-207.67; *PG* 32.489A).

¹⁰¹ For the dating of these letters, see Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 145. The dating of *ep.* 105 rests partly on the fact that the bearer of this letter was Sophronius, whom Basil calls his son (υἱόν). If this is the same person as the disciple of Eustathius mentioned in *ep.* 119, then the letter must have been sent before Basil's relationship with the Eustathians, Basil and Sophronius, went sour in late 372. See Loofs, *Eustathius*, p. 33.

¹⁰² According to Socrates [*h.e.* 2.39; 3.25 (*PG* 67.332B-336C, 452A-B)] and Sozomen [*h.e.* 6.4.3 (p.240.17-22; *PG* 67.1301A-B)] Silvanus was a prominent member of the Homoiousian party. At the Council of Seleucia in 359, where the Homoiousians vied with the Homoeans for the emperor Constantius' favour, Silvanus proposed the motion which led to the affirmation of the so-called Second creed of Antioch by the majority of the council [Socrates, *h.e.* 2.39-40 (*PG* 67.332B-345B)]. The pneumatological section of this creed emphasized the reality of the distinctive character of the Holy Spirit and described his activity chiefly in terms of sanctification [Socrates, *h.e.* 2.10 (*PG* 67.204A-B); see also Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 166-170; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 158-162]. However, the Homoiousian position failed to win the emperor's approval. This failure resulted in the deposition of the key Homoiousian leaders, including Silvanus, at the Homoean Council of Constantinople in the following year. On the reasons given by the Homoeans for Silvanus' deposition, see Sozomen, *h.e.* 4.24.12-13 (pp. 180.24181.5; *PG* 67.1193A). In 366 Silvanus, along with Eustathius of Sebaste and Theophilus of Castabala (see p. 39, n. 151), were commissioned by the Homoiousians to go to the west to seek support for their struggle against Eudoxius, the bishop of Constantinople, and his Homoean followers. On the results of this trip, see p. 39, n. 151. Silvanus died in 369 (Loofs, *Eustathius*, p. 50). Although his successor was a Homoean [see Basil, *ep.* 34 (I, 76-78; *PG* 32.320B-321B)], the majority of the community at Tarsus remained loyal to Silvanus' beliefs. Basil's opinion of Silvanus seems to have been always one of deep respect. See *ep.* 67 (I, 160.4; *PG* 32.428B); 244.3 (III, 77.22; *PG* 32.916B). On Silvanus' pneumatological views, see especially Michael A.G. Haykin, "ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ΣΙΛΒΑΝΟΣ: Silvanus of Tarsus and his View of the Spirit", *VChr*, 36 (1982), 261-274. For the pneumatological positions in the church at Tarsus after Silvanus' death, see *idem*, "And Who Is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus", *VChr*, 41 (1987), 377-385.

¹⁰³ Gribomont, "Intransigence", pp. 116-117.

and did not call the Spirit a creature.¹⁰⁴ *Ep.* 105, written in autumn 372, warns the daughters of Count Terence, a Christian interested in theological and ecclesial questions,¹⁰⁵ to avoid communion only with those who called the Spirit a creature or reduced him to the rank of a servant.

Nevertheless, this irenical position was not well received by some members of Basil's own monastic communities. In the latter months of 372, Gregory of Nazianzus wrote to his friend Basil about the following remarks which a monk made in his presence about Basil's confession of the faith in a sermon:¹⁰⁶

Basil [is]...the betrayer of the faith,... [for when] I heard the great Basil teaching about God, [he spoke] most excellently and perfectly about the Father and the Son...but he belittled (παρὰσύντοντος) the Spirit....He gives obscure indications and, so to speak, faint impressions of this teaching, but he does not speak the truth boldly. Rather he floods the ear with what is more political (πολιτικώτερον) than orthodox and conceals his duplicity by the power of his speech.

Basil's critic interprets the bishop's reserve to be tantamount to heresy. He even goes so far as to suggest that the reason why Basil has "betrayed the faith" is his desire to accommodate himself to the ecclesiastical situation of Asia Minor. This monk received such an affirmative response among Gregory's own followers that Gregory found himself unable to give an answer which satisfied his hearers. Consequently, he implored Basil to provide a reason for his reserve. Basil's answer, *ep.* 71, is hardly a courteous one; Gregory himself is reproached for listening to such ignominious reports! Basil refuses to justify his stance on the Holy Spirit; if his own life is not a sufficient answer, then a brief letter will certainly not convince his critics.¹⁰⁷ Dörries notes that the bitterness of Basil's reply is most easily understood if the monk who was critical of Basil was the spokesman for a large faction of Basil's monks.¹⁰⁸ This

¹⁰⁴ See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 19-21, 129-130; Gribomont, "Intransigence", pp. 116-119.

¹⁰⁵ On the life of Count Terence, see Edmund Venables, "Terentius", *DCB*, IV (1887), 817; Barnim Treucker, *Politische und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zu den Basilius-Briefen* (Frankfurt-am-Main: n.p., 1961), pp. 50-51; A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale and J. Morris, *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1971), I, 881-882.

¹⁰⁶ Paul Gallay, *Gregor von Nazianz: Briefe* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 53; Berlin: Akademie-verlag, 1969), p.xx. Jean Bernardi [*La Prédication des pères cappadociens. Le prédicateur et son auditoire* ([Paris]: Presses universitaires de France, 1968), p. 86] believes that *hom.* 15 (*PG* 31.464B-472B) was the sermon which scandalized this monk. However, on the dating of *hom.* 15, see p. 150 and n. 240.

¹⁰⁷ For further discussion, see Karl Holl, *Amphilochius von Ikonium in seinem Verhältnis zu den grossen Kappadoziern* (1904 ed.; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969), p. 140, n.2; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 23-25.

¹⁰⁸ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 25.

comment is confirmed by two letters from the hand of Athanasius, written approximately at the same time as that of Gregory. For such a venerable figure as Athanasius to address this issue is indicative of how audible the murmuring about Basil's position had become.¹⁰⁹ To the presbyters John and Antiochus,¹¹⁰ the bishop of Alexandria wrote:¹¹¹

I am very much amazed at the audacity of those who dare to speak against our beloved Basil the bishop, who is truly a servant of God. Because of such nonsense they can be reproved as ones who do not love the confession of the Fathers.

A more detailed explanation of Basil's conduct is given in *ep. Pall.* Palladius, a presbyter from Caesarea, had gone to live at the monastic community located on the Mount of Olives;¹¹² from there, he had written to Athanasius about Basil's position. Athanasius replied as follows:¹¹³

From Athanasius the bishop to my beloved son Palladius the presbyter, greetings in the Lord.

I rejoiced when I received your personal letter, especially since it is your habit to breathe orthodoxy. Not for the first time, but long ago, I learned the reason for your stay with our beloved Innocent, and I have approved of your pious life. Therefore because you are acting thus, write and tell me how the brethren are there and what the enemies of the truth think about me. But when you told me that the monks of Caesarea are distressed and opposed to our beloved bishop Basil, which I learned also from our beloved Dianius, I welcomed your information and I have pointed out to them what is proper: they should obey their father as children and not speak against what he approves. For if he were suspect with regard to the truth, their fight would be commendable. But if they are confident, as all of us are, that he is the pride of the church, striving on behalf of the truth and teaching those who need it, then it is not right to dispute with such a person, but rather to welcome his good conscience. For, from what our beloved Dianius related, they appear to be distressed for no reason. For I am confident that to the weak he has become weak in order that he might gain the weak. But let our beloved brethren, when they look at the aim (τὸν σκοπόν) of his truth and at his prudent reserve (τὴν οἰκονομίαν) praise the Lord, who has given such a bishop to Cappadocia, as every region prays to have. And therefore, beloved, I want you to explain to them that they must obey what I have written. For this keeps them faithful to their father, as well as preserves peace in the churches.

I bid you farewell in the Lord, beloved son.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹¹⁰ On these two men, see Louis Sébastien le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires Pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six Premiers siècles* (Paris: 1703), IX, 150; Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. 579, n.l.

¹¹¹ *Ep. Jo. et Ant.* (PG 26.1168A).

¹¹² See *ep.* 258.2 (III, 101.12-102.20; PG 32.949B), where Palladius seems to be one of the spokesmen for the monastic community at the Mount of Olives. In this letter, he is mentioned once again in connection with the question of the Holy Spirit. See pp. 48-49.

¹¹³ *Ep. Pall.* (PG 26.1168B-1169A).

The emphasis in this letter upon obedience, along with its frequent mention of opposition to Basil, indicates that the dispute within the monastic community of Caesarea was a significant one.¹¹⁴ But Athanasius clearly approves of Basil's dogmatic position, as well as his method of teaching, which, for Athanasius, is best described in the words of 1 Cor 9:22: to those weak in faith Basil has become weak in order that he might gain their support for his position.¹¹⁵

Probably, *fid.*, from Basil's collection of ascetic treatises, was composed at this time.¹¹⁶ In this work, Basil relies solely on Scriptural terminology to demonstrate his orthodoxy to questioning monks, who were disturbed at Basil's reserve. The opposition to Basil's conduct may have reached such a pitch that Basil felt compelled to provide this written statement of his position. Be that as it may, this confrontation with the zealous orthodoxy of some of his monks reveals Basil's individuality and his refusal to follow the dictates of others. Yet, his position is not one of compromise, as is clearly shown in his willingness to break with his old friend Eustathius, when he became convinced of the latter's heresy.

Orthodox zealots were to be found not only within the Basilian monastic communities, but also among the bishops of northern Asia Minor. The leading figures there were Meletius of Antioch and Theodotus of Nicopolis. Originally Meletius was numbered among the Homoeans. At the end of the fifties, the Homoeans chose him as bishop of Sebaste to take the place of Eustathius whom they had deposed.¹¹⁷ In 360, at the Synod of Constantinople, the victorious Homoeans transferred Meletius to Antioch in Syria. Although Meletius soon fell out of favour with the Homoeans there and was replaced by the Arian Euzoïus, his followers continued to maintain that he was the rightful bishop of Antioch. The situation at Antioch was further complicated by the fact that Meletius soon joined the Nicene party. This affiliation meant that there were now two orthodox communities in Antioch: the Meletians and the Eustathians (not to be confused with the disciples of Eustathius of Sebaste). The latter revered the memory of Eustathius of Antioch (deposed by the Arians *ca.* 330¹¹⁸) and refused communion with the Meletians, because

¹¹⁴ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 25.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26. See also Joseph de Ghellinck, "Un Cas de conscience dans les conflits trinitaires sur le Saint-Esprit" in his *Patristique et moyen âge* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1948), III, 326-330.

¹¹⁶ See excursus II.

¹¹⁷ Loofs, *Eustathius*, p. 66; Gribomont, "Esotérisme", p. 30.

¹¹⁸ On Eustathius of Antioch's deposition; see R.V. Sellers, *Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1928), pp. 39-56.

Meletius had been installed by the Homoeans. The schism which resulted between these two groups not only weakened the orthodox cause in the city of Antioch, but also prevented a union between the western and eastern Nicenes. Basil and the eastern Nicenes (or Neo-Nicenes)¹¹⁹ supported Meletius, while Athanasius and the western Nicenes recognized Paulinus, the bishop of the Eustathian community.¹²⁰ Basil was tireless in his efforts to secure recognition for Meletius in the west, but, in his own lifetime, he did not succeed. Meletius, for his part, was very anxious to demonstrate his orthodoxy to the western Nicenes. Consequently, around 370, he and his followers confessed the Spirit to be one in being with the Father and the Son.¹²¹

Meletius was now living in exile at Getasa, near Nicopolis, as a guest of Theodotus. This arrangement probably angered Eustathius, whose personal disagreements with Meletius went back to that Homoean synod which had given Eustathius' see of Sebaste to Meletius.¹²² Theodotus also had an extremely poor relationship with Eustathius, who was technically his metropolitan. Eustathius had been exiled by Valens in 367,¹²³ and although he remained at Sebaste, he was never officially reinstated as metropolitan of *Armenia prima*. Theodotus took advantage of this state of affairs to assert his independence, and held an annual synod at Nicopolis, to which evidently Eustathius was not invited. There, the major item of discussion was the clarification of the orthodox faith.¹²⁴ A further cause for the hostility between the two men may have been Theodotus' antipathy to monasticism.¹²⁵

¹¹⁹ The Neo-Nicenes were those, led by the former Homoeans Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata, who had accepted the Nicene creed during the reign of Jovian (363-364). See also Gwatkin, *Studies*, pp. 230-231; W.-D. Hauschild, trans., *Basilius von Caesarea: Briefe* (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, vol. 3; Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1973) II, 2 and 155, nn. 1, 2.

¹²⁰ See Marcel Richard, "Saint Basile et la mission du diacre Sabinus", *AB*, LXVI (1949), 186; Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, "Damase, Athanase, Pierre, Mélèce et Basile. Les rapports de communion ecclésiastique entre les Églises de Rome, d'Alexandrie, d'Antioche et de Césarée de Cappadoce (370-379)" in *1054-1954. L'Église et les églises* (Namur: Éditions de Chevetogne, 1954), pp. 261-277.

¹²¹ Epiphanius, *haer.* 73.34.2-5 (p.309.5-21; *PG* 42.468A-B). See also Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1082; Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 76, n.5.

¹²² Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 65-67; Eduard Schwartz, "Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts", *ZNTW*, XXXIV (1935), 162; Ritter, *Konzil*, p.76, n.5. Pace Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 195, n.l.

¹²³ Sozomen, *h.e.* 6.12.5 (p.252.12-16; *PG* 67.1324B). See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 195, n.l.

¹²⁴ See Basil, *epp.* 95 (I, 207-208; *PG* 32.489B-D); 99.2 (I, 214.1-3; *PG* 32.500A) See also Gribomont, "Eustathe", col. 30; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 122-124.

¹²⁵ Fausta Zuchetti, "Eustazio di Sebaste e Basilio di Cesarea", *RR*, II (1926), 18, n.l. See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 29.

Neither Meletius nor Theodotus would have co-signed with Eustathius the above-mentioned circular letter (*ep.* 92), if they had had serious doubts about the orthodoxy of the bishop of Sebaste.¹²⁶ Nonetheless, their reservations about Eustathius must have begun to take shape shortly afterwards.¹²⁷ Ritter has persuasively argued that, from 367 to 372, Eustathius, at the head of a majority of the Homoiousians,¹²⁸ strove to lessen the differences between themselves and the Neo-Nicenes, led by Meletius.¹²⁹ Clear evidence for this is *ep.* 92, where, among the signatures of the key leaders of the Neo-Nicenes, that of Eustathius is found.¹³⁰ The major stumbling-block to a permanent alliance of the two parties was the question which Athanasius had faced in Egypt at the end of the fifties: what is the nature and status of the Holy Spirit? The outcome of Athanasius' dispute with the Tropicis was the synodal statement issued at Alexandria in 362: those who said that the Spirit was a creature and who separated him from the being of Christ should be anathema.¹³¹ By the end of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies, the focus of discussion between the Homoiousians and the Neo-Nicenes had perceptibly shifted to the question of the Spirit. During the same period, the direction taken by the Alexandrian synod was seen increasingly by the Neo-Nicenes to be normative for the rejection of Arianism in all its guises.¹³² As noted, Meletius and his followers confessed the Spirit to be one in being with the Father and the Son around 370. Pressure must have been put on Eustathius to forsake his old middle position, to which he still subscribed and which, as Basil notes in a letter to Eusebius of Samosata, he cherished.¹³³ By the end of 372, Meletius and Theodotus were thus extremely suspicious of Eustathius' pneumatological views.

¹²⁶ See p.29.

¹²⁷ These reservations are apparent in Basil, *epp.* 95 (I, 207-208; PG 32.489B-D); 99.1-3 (I,214.1-217.36; PG 32.497B-501C). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 32-35; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 197, n.2.

¹²⁸ On a recalcitrant minority, led by Eleusius of Cyzicus, who refused to seek union with the Neo-Nicenes, see pp. 177-179, 195-196.

¹²⁹ *Konzil*, pp. 71-73. See also Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1083.

¹³⁰ The name of a certain Marcianus also occurs in the list of names in *ep.* 92.1 (I.198.5; PG 32.477A). Socrates [*h.e.* 5.8 (PG 67.576C-577A)] and Sozomen [*h.e.* 7.7.2-3 (p.308.20-22; PG 67.1429B-C)] both state that a Marcianus of Lampascus was an important Pneumatomachian leader in the Hellespont. Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", p. 212, n.1) argues that the Marcianus of Basil's letter ought to be identified with the Pneumatomachian bishop of Lampascus. If he is correct then there is evidence that at least two among the thirty-two bishops who endorsed the circular letter had Pneumatomachian tendencies. See also W. Ensslin, "Marcianus", *PWK*, XIV/2 (1930), 1531.

¹³¹ See pp. 23-24.

¹³² Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 73.

¹³³ See p. 27, n. 86.

The Pneumatomachian environment around Eustathius only helped to give substance to their suspicions.¹³⁴

Consequently, in late 372/early 373¹³⁵, Basil came under fire from his episcopal colleagues, specifically Meletius and Theodotus, for his friendship with Eustathius. Basil, by associating with a suspected heretic, was himself dogmatically suspect!¹³⁶ Basil found himself in an unenviable position, caught in the crossfire between the two sides. On the one hand, he was slandered by Eustathius' followers for reasons which are not entirely clear, but which surely came to include his dogmatic views on the Spirit, unacceptable to many of Eustathius' Pneumatomachian followers. On the other hand, he was dogmatically suspect to a large faction of his own monks and a sizeable number of his episcopal colleagues, including Meletius and Theodotus, for his friendship with Eustathius and his prudent reserve on the subject of the Holy Spirit.¹³⁷ Accordingly Meletius and Theodotus invited Basil to meet with them in June 373 at Phargamos, near Nicopolis, to clarify his position.¹³⁸

However, on his way to this meeting, Basil stopped at Sebaste in order to confront Eustathius with the charges laid against him by Theodotus, and thus determine Eustathius' orthodoxy.¹³⁹ After a two-day meeting, which Basil's tachygraphers recorded,¹⁴⁰ Basil was convinced of Eustathius' doctrinal agreement with himself and his episcopal colleagues. Basil, in a report to Count Terence, writes about this discussion:¹⁴¹

We had a lengthy discussion with one another, and all of that day was spent in the examination of these matters [the charges laid by Theodotus against Eustathius]. Finally, when evening had come, we parted company, without

¹³⁴ On Eustathius' Pneumatomachian disciples, see Basil, *ep.* 99.2,3 (I, 215.14-18, 216.10-13; *PG* 32.500B, 501A); 244.2 (III, 74.1-75.13; *PG* 32.913A-B). Cf. *ep.* 128.2 (II, 38.1-6; *PG* 32.556A-B). See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 58; *idem*, *Briefe*, II, 5.

¹³⁵ The dates for 373 which are followed henceforward are those of Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", pp. 191-205; *Briefe*, II, 9-17; see also Fedwick, *Charisma*, 145-147). Loofs (*Eustathius*, *passim*), Lietzmann (*Apollinaris*, pp. 48-53), Dörries, (*De Spiritu Sancto*, *passim*), and Gribomont ("Esotérisme", *passim*; "Intransigence", *passim*) place most of these events in 372.

¹³⁶ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 195-196. See also Zuchetti, "Eustazio", p. 18.

¹³⁷ Cf. Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IX, 143.

¹³⁸ That Basil wrote to his old friend Eusebius requesting that Eusebius accompany him for support shows that Basil was well aware of the dogmatic differences between Eustathius and Theodotus [*ep.* 95 (I, 207-208; *PG* 32.489B-D)]. See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 197, n.2; Gribomont, "Esotérisme", pp.33-34.

¹³⁹ *Ep.* 99.2 (I, 214.1-216.34; *PG* 32.500A-C).

¹⁴⁰ See pp. 108-113, *passim*.

¹⁴¹ *Ep.* 99.2 (I, 215.10-25; *PG* 32.500A-B). See also *ep.* 98.2 (I, 212.6-213.11; *PG* 32.496C), written to Eusebius at the end of June 373: "Another meeting with the most revered bishop Eustathius was expected, and this we have had. For, because there was an outcry by many against him that he was a falsifier of the faith, we held a conference with him and we found, with God's [grace], that he is in accord with all that is orthodox."

having brought our discussion to any acknowledged conclusion. Again on the next day we took up our positions early in the morning and discussed the same points. Our brother Poimenius, a presbyter of Sebaste, arrived at this juncture and vehemently pressed the doctrine opposite to ours. Little by little, however, we rid ourselves of the charges which he seemed [to bring] against us. Then we brought them to an agreement concerning the points which we had investigated, so that, by the grace of God, we were not found to differ from one another in the slightest degree. Thus, somewhere around the ninth hour we rose up for prayer, after we had given thanks to the Lord who gave us the same mind and voice.

Theodotus, on the other hand, convinced that Basil was now in communion with a heretic, no longer desired Basil's presence at the synod. As Basil reports to Count Terence:¹⁴²

Before the followers of bishop Theodotus learned why we [Basil and Eustathius] had met and what had been accomplished by our colloquy, they no longer deemed us worthy of an invitation to the synod.

Basil decided to journey to Getasa to discuss these matters with Meletius; while he was there, Theodotus appeared. Basil convinced his colleagues to draw up with him a statement of faith for Eustathius to sign, for then they would have a written attestation of Eustathius' orthodoxy.¹⁴³ This statement of faith is recorded in Basil's *ep.* 125. The pneumatological statement occurs after the citation of the Nicene creed; it reads as follows:¹⁴⁴

The other doctrines here are sufficiently and accurately defined...but the doctrine concerning the Spirit is mentioned cursorily as requiring no elaboration, because at that time this question had not yet been raised. But the concept of it existed securely in the souls of the believers. Little by little, however, the evil seeds of impiety grew. Formerly these [seeds] were cast down by Arius, the champion of the heresy, but later they were nurtured by his evil successors to the distress of the churches, and the consequent impiety ended in the blasphemy against the Spirit. [Therefore] it is necessary to set the [following] statement before those who have no consideration for themselves and who do not foresee the inevitable threat which our Lord held over those who blaspheme against the Holy Spirit. They must anathematize those who call the Holy Spirit a creature, those who think so, and those who do not confess that he is holy by nature, as the Father and Son are holy by nature, but who regard him as alien to the divine and blessed nature. A proof of orthodox doctrine is the refusal to separate him from the Father and Son (for we must be baptized as we have received [the words], and we must believe as we are baptized, and we must give honour as we have believed, to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit), and to withdraw from the communion of those who call the Spirit a creature since they are clearly blasphemers. It is agreed (this comment is

¹⁴² *Ep.* 99.2 (I, 216.35-38; *PG* 32.500C). See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 197.

¹⁴³ *Ep.* 99.3 (I, 217.22-26; *PG* 32.501B).

¹⁴⁴ *Ep.* 125.3 (II, 33.1-34.39; *PG* 32.549A-C).

necessary because of the slanderers) that we do not say that the Holy Spirit is either unbegotten (ἀγέννητον), for we know one unbegotten and one source (ἀρχήν) of what exists, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or begotten, for we have been taught by the tradition of the faith that there is one Only-Begotten. But since we have been taught that the Spirit of truth proceeds from the Father we confess that he is from God without being created (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι ... ἀκτίστως). Also they must anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a ministering [spirit] since they reduce him to the rank of a creature by this term. For the Scriptures imparted to us that the ministering spirits are creatures since it states 'all are ministering spirits sent forth for service' [Heb 1:14].

The model for this statement about the Holy Spirit is the document issued by the Alexandrian synod in 362. However, whereas Athanasius' focus is on the inseparable nature of the triune God, Basil's emphasis is placed on the natural holiness of the Spirit. Since the Spirit is holy without qualification, he cannot be a creature and must be indivisibly one with the divine nature.¹⁴⁵ The confession of this unity is both the criterion of orthodoxy and the basis upon which communion can be terminated with those who affirm that the Spirit is a creature. This pneumatological position thus defines the precise limits beyond which Basil was not prepared to venture, even for a friend such as Eustathius.¹⁴⁶

Basil travelled back to Sebaste in August 373, where Eustathius subsequently signed this document.¹⁴⁷ At that time Basil proposed a synod, the date and place of which were set, at which this agreement could be ratified and the future communion between Basil and his colleagues and Eustathius could be placed on a firm foundation.¹⁴⁸ But Basil had pushed his old friend too far. Their relationship was already strained by the affair of the Eustathian monks in the previous year. Now, Eustathius, swayed by his Pneumatomachian disciples, repudiated the signature given to Basil's document and failed to appear at the appointed meeting.¹⁴⁹ Compromised in the eyes of the Nicene followers of Theodotus,¹⁵⁰ and repudiated by the Pneumatomachian disciples of Eustathius, Basil found himself isolated; his attempt to defuse the controversy over the Holy Spirit in an irenic fashion had proved to be a failure.

After his failure to appear at the gathering proposed by Basil, Eustathius departed for Cilicia, accompanied by an old friend, Theophilus

¹⁴⁵ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 37-39.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-40.

¹⁴⁷ *Ep.* 244.2 (III, 75.13-21; *PG* 32.913B-C).

¹⁴⁸ *Ep.* 244.2 (III, 75.20-25; *PG* 32.913C).

¹⁴⁹ *Ep.* 130.1 (II, 42.13-19; *PG* 32.564A).

¹⁵⁰ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 201.

of Castabala.¹⁵¹ There, at a series of Pneumatomachian synods, Eustathius criticized Basil's actions and denounced him for what he felt were doctrinal innovations.¹⁵² A creed also was drawn up by Eustathius and presented to a certain Gelasius, possibly a Pneumatomachian under whose aegis the Cilician synods were held.¹⁵³ Basil later remarked that this creed could have been written only by Arius or one of his disciples!¹⁵⁴ Upon his return to Sebaste, Eustathius sent a letter to Caesarea to notify Basil that he had ceased to be in communion with him.¹⁵⁵ A pretext for this action was found in the fact that Basil had been in communication with Apollinaris of Laodicea, whose theological views were considered heretical by Eustathius and his associates.¹⁵⁶ Eustathius attacked Basil's pneumatological views with the charge that they had literary affinities with those of Apollinaris.¹⁵⁷ Basil responded to these charges with silence. As he wrote later in 376.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵¹ Theophilus was originally the bishop of Eleutheropolis in Palestine, but was later transferred to Castabala in Cilicia around 358. Like Eustathius, he was condemned by the Homean Synod of Constantinople in 360. Theophilus, along with Eustathius and Silvanus of Tarsus (see p. 30, n. 102), was later commissioned by the Homoiousians to go to the west to seek support in their struggle against Eudoxius and the Homoeans, whose viewpoint was favoured by Valens. The Homoiousians especially desired aid from the emperor Valentinian, who supported the Nicene party, and from Liberius, the bishop of Rome [Socrates, *h.e.* 4.12 PG 67.484A-485A]; Sozomen, *h.e.* 6.10.3-4 (pp. 249.13-26; PG 67.1317C-1320A)]. The envoys never met with Valentinian, but they did confer with Liberius. The bishop of Rome received them into communion on the basis of a written confession of their faith which acknowledged the Nicene creed. When Theophilus and his companions proceeded to Sicily, Liberius' decision was ratified by a synod of Sicilian bishops [Socrates, *h.e.* 10.5-12.1 (pp. 250.1251.14; PG 67.1320A-1321C)]; see also Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1081; Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 70, n.4]. Noteworthy is the fact that neither Liberius nor the Sicilian bishops questioned Eustathius, Theophilus and Silvanus on their view of the Holy Spirit's status and nature. Despite Athanasius' and Didymus' recent debate with the Pneumatomachi of Egypt, the question of the Spirit was still not considered a central doctrinal issue (Gwatkin, *Studies*, pp. 236-237; Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 72). According to Andreas Bigelmair ["Theophilus", *LTK*, X (1965), 90], Theophilus died around 377. On the life of Theophilus, see also Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IX, 673, n.63; Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 164, n. 105.

¹⁵² *Ep.* 130.1 (II, 42.16-19; PG 32.564A). Cf. *ep.* 244.2 (III, 76.38-50; PG 32.913D-916A). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 41-42; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 205, 215.

¹⁵³ *Ep.* 130.1 (II, 42.21-43.22; PG 32.564A). Cf. *ep.* 224.2 (III, 76.48-50; PG 32.916A). See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 205, n.2; 215.

¹⁵⁴ *Ep.* 130.1 (II, 43.22-23; PG 32.564A).

¹⁵⁵ *Ep.* 244.2 (III, 76.49-50; PG 32.916A).

¹⁵⁶ *Ep.* 244.3 (III, 76.1-7; PG 32.916A-B). See also Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 23-24; Ekkehard Mühlberg, *Apollinaris von Laodicea* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), p. 30; Gribomont, "Intransigence", pp. 123-124.

¹⁵⁷ To Patrophilus of Aegea, Basil wrote [*ep.* 244.3 (III, 76.7-9; PG 32.916B)]: "I am not conscious of either having requested a book on the Holy Spirit from him or of having received one which he sent." See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 204; Mühlberg, *Apollinaris*, pp. 30-31, 37.

¹⁵⁸ *Ep.* 244.4 (III, 77.1-5.6-7, 78.23-25, 27-28; PG 32.916C-D, 917A-B). Cf. *epp.* 226.1 (III, 24.18-35; PG 32.844A-B); 130.2 (II, 43.5-7; PG 32.564B). Other factors for Basil's

Reduced [to helplessness] by this letter, as was understandable, and astounded at so unexpected and sudden a change, I was not even able to respond. For my heart was crushed, my tongue was paralyzed, my hand benumbed, and I experienced the suffering of an ignoble soul...and I almost fell into misanthropy...[So] I was not silent through disdain...but through dismay and perplexity and the inability to say anything proportionate to my grief.

During and after this period of Basil's silence the Pneumatomachi, under the leadership of Eustathius, scored great gains in Asia Minor. One major consequence of the Cilician synods of 373 was that most of the Cilician bishops went over to the side of Eustathius.¹⁵⁹ Sebaste, the metropolis of *Armenia prima* in northern Asia Minor, was definitely a Pneumatomachian centre,¹⁶⁰ although many of the bishops and churches of the province supported Basil.¹⁶¹ The allegiance of these Armenians to Basil is well illustrated by the events which occurred in Nicopolis after the death of Theodotus in December 375.¹⁶² Eustathius had to resort to violence in order to install his disciple Fronto¹⁶³ as bishop of Nicopolis, since a large section of the Nicopolitan presbyterate refused to recognize the Pneumatomachian candidate. This recalcitrant group, encouraged by Basil, proceeded to worship outside of the city under the open sky.¹⁶⁴

Hellespont, whence came a sizeable number of the Pneumatomachian bishops present at the Council of Constantinople in 381,¹⁶⁵ was decidedly in favour of the Pneumatomachi.¹⁶⁶ In other regions in northern Asia Minor — Galatia, Paphlagonia, Hellenopontus — the Pneumatomachi

silence include his relative isolation from the Neo-Nicenes (see pp. 36-37), two lengthy illnesses, and his basically irenic character. See Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 6. On the differing estimations of the length of this silence, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IX, 205; Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 19-20; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 103; 107, n.3; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 204-205.

¹⁵⁹ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 215-216.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

¹⁶¹ For example: Poemenius of Satala, whom Basil himself installed on a trip to Armenia [see *epp.* 99.4 (I, 218.17-19; *PG* 32.504A); 102 (II, 2-4; *PG* 32.508B-509A); 103 (II, 4; *PG* 32.509A-B); 122 (II, 27-28, *PG* 32.541B-544A); see also W. Ensslin, "Poimenios", *PWK*, XXI/1 (1951) 1211; Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 157-158, n.31]; Euphronius of Colonia [*ep.* 195 (II, 148; *PG* 32.708B-C)], who was installed, though only for a brief period, by Poemenius as bishop of Nicopolis after Theodotus' death in 375 [see *epp.* 227-230 (III, 29-36; *PG* 32.852A-860C); see also Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 177, n.252; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 124]; Otreius of Melitene [*ep.* 181 (II, 116-117; *PG* 32.657C); see also Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 172, n.203].

¹⁶² For the report of Theodotus' death, see *ep.* 237.2 (III, 57.27-28; *PG* 32.888B). See also Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 13, 17.

¹⁶³ *Epp.* 237.2 (III, 57.24-35; *PG* 32.888B-C); 238 (III, 57-58; *PG* 32.889A-C). This Fronto is possibly the Eustathian disciple mentioned in *ep.* 125 (II, 34.53; *PG* 32.552A), although this cannot be proven (Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IX, 253-254; Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 14, n.8).

¹⁶⁴ *Epp.* 238 (III, 58.20-27; *PG* 32.889B-C); 240.2 (III, 63.18-24; *PG* 32.896C-897A). See also Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 13-16.

¹⁶⁵ See pp. 178-179.

were also very active and managed to bring a fair number of bishops from these provinces into their camp.¹⁶⁷ Even in "orthodox" Cappadocia the Pneumatomachi made great headway.¹⁶⁸ Ecdicius, installed at Parnassus,¹⁶⁹ helped to drive out from Nyssa Basil's own brother, Gregory, and appoint in his stead a Pneumatomachian sympathizer.¹⁷⁰ Doara, to the east of Nyssa, was also occupied by an opponent of Basil.¹⁷¹ So active were the Pneumatomachi in Cappadocia that even a community of consecrated virgins near Colonia was thrown into turmoil by Pneumatomachian agitation.¹⁷²

Some of this success may be attributed to the fact that Eustathius and his followers had joined forces with those whom Eustathius had once zealously fought, the Homoeans.¹⁷³ This union was ratified at a synod held at Ancyra in Galatia, in 375.¹⁷⁴ Hauschild regards this union as an ecclesiastical necessity for Eustathius, who otherwise would have found himself in an isolated and indefensible position in the struggle between the Homoean and Nicene parties.¹⁷⁵ Be this as it may, Eustathius' collaboration with the Homoeans meant that now he could draw upon the powers of Demosthenes, the imperial vicar of the diocese of Pontus,¹⁷⁶

¹⁶⁶ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 212.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 213-214.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 213. See also Gribomont, "Esotérisme", p. 39.

¹⁶⁹ *Ep.* 237.2 (III, 56.9-10; *PG* 32.888A). Cf. *epp.* 226.2 (III, 25.22-34; *PG* 32.845A-B); 239.1 (III, 59.12-19; *PG* 32.892A-B).

¹⁷⁰ *Epp.* 239.1 (III, 59.19-22; *PG* 32.892B); 231 (III, 37.19-21; *PG* 32.861B). See also Gribomont, "Eustathe", col. 32.

¹⁷¹ *Ep.* 239.1 (III, 59.22-60.27; *PG* 32.892B). Cf. *ep.* 231 (III, 37.21-22, 26-27; *PG* 32.861B).

¹⁷² *Ep.* 52 (I, 133-137; *PG* 32.392A-396C). On the date of this letter, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 115, n.1; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 213, n.3.

¹⁷³ On Eustathius' long-standing opposition to Eudoxius, a key figure in the Homoean party, see Sozomen, *h.e.* 4.13.4-6 (p. 156.5-18; *PG* 67. 1145B-1148A). See also Venables, "Eustathius", p. 385; Friedrich Loofs, "Eustathius of Sebaste", *SHERK*, IV (1909), 214-215.

¹⁷⁴ *Epp.* 226.2 (III, 25.18-22; *PG* 32.845A); 237.2 (III, 56.8-9; *PG* 32.888A). Cf. *ep.* 251.3 (III, 91.22-24; *PG* 32.936C-937A). Loofs (*Eustathius*, pp. 11-12) and Lietzmann (*Apollinaris*, p. 48) place this synod in December, 375. Hauschild (*Briefe*, II, 9-10) believes it occurred in January or February of that year. Support for Hauschild's revised dating is given by Reinhard Hübner [*Basilius von Caesarea: Briefe. Zweiter Teil. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert von Wolf-Dieter Hauschild*], *TR*, LXX (1974), 462-463].

¹⁷⁵ "Pneumatomachen", pp. 205-206. See also Loofs, *Eustathius*, p. 18, n.3; Gribomont, "Eustathe", pp. 31-32.

¹⁷⁶ Basil, on one occasion [*ep.* 231 (III, 37.21-22; *PG* 32.861B)] described Demosthenes as the "gross sea-monster" and on another [*ep.* 237.2 (III, 56.1-8; *PG* 32.885B-888A)] wrote: "The vicar, the first and greatest of our evils, visited us. I do not know whether the man is a heretic at heart (actually I think that he is unacquainted with all doctrine and has neither zeal nor care for such things, for I see him engrossed soul and body, night and day, in other matters). But in any case he is fond of heretics and loves them no more than he hates us." On Demosthenes, see also Edmund Venables, "Demosthenes", *DCB*, I (1877), 813; Reilly, *Imperium*, pp. 62-77; Jones, Martindale, Morris, *Prosopography*, I, 249.

to dominate the ecclesiastical scene of northern Asia Minor.¹⁷⁷ The tremendous respect which Eustathius generated by his holy life may be cited as another reason for the initial success of the Pneumatomachi.¹⁷⁸ The silence of Nicaea on the question of the Spirit¹⁷⁹ and the deep uncertainty of many eastern authors with regard to the status and nature of the Spirit also aided the cause of the Pneumatomachi. Finally, Eustathius conducted such an effective smear campaign against Basil that the latter's name was regarded with abhorrence by many in Asia Minor.¹⁸⁰ This opinion of Basil seriously hampered the defence of the Spirit's divinity.

Foremost among the slanders about Basil circulated by the Pneumatomachi was the one which had served as a pretext for Eustathius' break with Basil in 373: Basil was in communion with one suspected of heresy, namely Apollinaris. In an open letter from Eustathius to a certain Dazizas, written in the winter of 374 to 375,¹⁸¹ this charge was expanded: Basil's trinitarian theology, especially his pneumatology,¹⁸² was infested with Sabellianism as a result of his friendship with Apollinaris! This accusation was substantiated by the citation of certain passages, of which the author was not named, but which, taken by themselves, might well be understood in a Sabellian sense.¹⁸³ Basil realized that the inclusion of these anonymous statements, which he rightly judged to be

¹⁷⁷ At one point, Basil himself was faced with the prospect of exile. See *ep.* 129.2 (II, 40-41; *PG* 32.560B); Gregory of Nazianzus, *or.* 43.68 (*PG* 36.585D-588A). See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 206.

¹⁷⁸ According to the Anomoean historian Philostorgius [*h.e.* 8.17 (p.115.18-20; *PG* 65.568A)], Eustathius, when an old man, was accorded much respect by a "great number of people" (τῶν πολλῶν). Sozomen [*h.e.* 3.14.36 (p.124.8-13; *PG* 67.1080B-C)] notes that he was renowned for the purity of his life. See also Loofs, *Eustathius*, p. 97; Clarke, *St. Basil*, p. 159; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 224.

¹⁷⁹ See p. 17.

¹⁸⁰ *Ep.* 212.2 (II, 199.9-15; *PG* 32.781A).

¹⁸¹ *Epp.* 244.5 (III, 78.1-79.17; *PG* 32.917B-C); 131 (II, 44-46; *PG* 32.565A-568C). See also Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris*, p. 32. For the date, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 107, n.3.

¹⁸² Cf p. 39.

¹⁸³ *Ep.* 129.1 (II, 40.7-17; *PG* 32.557C-560A): "[The letter] contains such expressions as these: 'Therefore it is necessary to conceive the first identity always in conjunction, or, rather in union, with the difference, and to say that the second and third [identities] are the same. For what the Father is firstly, the Son is this secondly and the Spirit thirdly. And again, what the Spirit is firstly, the Son is this secondly, in so far as the Lord is also the Spirit [cf. 2 Cor 3:17], and the Father thirdly, in so far as the Spirit is God [cf. Jn 4:24]. And, to express the inexpressible with greater force, the Father is the Son paternally and the Son is the Father filially. And likewise with the Spirit, in so far as the Trinity is one God'." For a discussion of this citation, see G.L. Prestige, *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*, ed. from his papers by Henry Chadwick (London: S.P.C.K., 1956), pp. 27, 36-37; Henri de Riedmatten, "La Correspondence entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire de Laodicée", *JTS*, n.s., VIII (1957), 63-65. See also Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris*, pp. 32, 35-37.

Apollinarian in origin,¹⁸⁴ within a document written against him would convince people that he was their author or, at least, was in full agreement with them.¹⁸⁵ Both Hans Lietzmann¹⁸⁶ and Dörries¹⁸⁷ regard this open letter to Dazizas as the occasion which caused Basil to break his silence. As Basil wrote in his open letter to Eustathius:¹⁸⁸

‘A time to be silent and a time to speak’ [Eccl 3:7] says the maxim of Ecclesiastes. Since there has been ample time for silence, surely, therefore, now is the right moment finally to open our mouth in order to reveal the truth concerning matters which are misunderstood.

Basil goes on to describe his long friendship with Eustathius which began with Basil’s conversion to the ascetic life. Surely, therefore, Eustathius should have known that Basil’s views on the Godhead were perfectly orthodox, and that Apollinaris had never been his teacher.¹⁸⁹ His faith, Basil asserts, had always been orthodox.¹⁹⁰

I dare to boast in the Lord of this one item at least, that I have never had erroneous notions about God, nor did I, thinking differently [than now], learn new [notions] later. But the same concept of God which I received as a child from my blessed mother and grandmother Macrina I retained and developed. For, in the development of my faculty of reason, I did not receive one concept from one source and another from another, but perfected those principles which they imparted to me. For, just as the [seed] grows from small to larger, but remains the same in itself, not changing in kind, but being perfected by growth, so I consider that in my case the same doctrine has grown through [various] stages of development.

This vigorous defense of his position vis-à-vis Apollinaris and this rebuttal of Eustathius’ charges was conducted by Basil in a number of letters written in the years 375 and 376.¹⁹¹

Meanwhile, Basil had been working steadily on the composition of his *magnum opus* on the Holy Spirit. The immediate occasion for the composition of *Spir.* came from an external source. At the annual feast

¹⁸⁴ *Epp.* 129.1 (II, 40.25-30; *PG* 32.560A); 131.1 (II, 44.17-45.20; *PG* 32.565B)

¹⁸⁵ *Ep.* 129.1 (II, 40.20-25; *PG* 32.560A). See also Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris*, pp. 28-29.

¹⁸⁶ *Apollinaris*, p. 49.

¹⁸⁷ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 107, n.3.

¹⁸⁸ *Ep.* 223.1 (III, 8.1-4; *PG* 32.820C).

¹⁸⁹ *Ep.* 223.4-6 (III, 13-16; *PG* 32.828A-833A). See also Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris*, p. 35.

¹⁹⁰ *Ep.* 223.3 (III, 12.33-13.44; *PG* 32.825C-828A). There is an excellent discussion of this passage in Dörries, “Basilus”, pp. 136-137. See also Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, “The Pair KHPYΓMA and ΔΟΓMA in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea”, *JTS*, n.s. XVI (1965), 141-142.

¹⁹¹ See *epp.* 52 (I, 133-137; *PG* 32.392A-396C); 129.1 (II, 39-40; *PG* 32.557B-560B); 130-131 (II, 42-46; *PG* 32.561B-568C); 159 (II, 85-87; *PG* 32.620B-621C); 212 (II, 198-200; *PG* 32.780B-781C); 223-224 (III, 8-21; *PG* 32.820C-840A); 226 (III, 23-29; *PG* 32.841C-852A); 244 (III, 73-83; *PG* 32.912B-924D); 250-251 (III, 87-93; *PG* 32.929C-940A).

for the martyr Eupsychius held at Caesarea on 5 or 7 September, 374,¹⁹² some of the participants questioned the propriety of two doxologies used by Basil.

Not long ago when I was praying with the people I rendered the doxology due to God the Father in two forms: sometimes 'with (μετά) the Son together with (σύν) the Holy Spirit' and other times 'through (διά) the Son in (ἐν) the Holy Spirit'. Some of those who were present accused us of using new and mutually contradictory terms.¹⁹³

Amphilochius of Iconium, the cousin of Gregory of Nazianzus and disciple of Basil,¹⁹⁴ requested from his mentor a written answer to this liturgical question which definitely had dogmatic importance.¹⁹⁵ Just over a year later, at the end of 375, Basil was able to write to Amphilochius:¹⁹⁶

We have been writing the book on the Spirit and as you know, it is completed. But the brothers who are with me prevented me from sending it written on papyrus, saying that they had orders from your Excellency to write it in a book of parchment. Therefore, not to appear to do anything which is contrary to your command, we are holding it back now but shall send it a little later, if only we find someone who is suitable to carry it.

Throughout this treatise on the Holy Spirit Basil argues that the Spirit must be accorded the same honour and glory as the Father and the Son. The baptismal formula is vital to his argument, for it reveals that the Spirit is inseparable from the Father and the Son.¹⁹⁷ Ranked alongside, not below, them, the Spirit participates with the Father and the Son in the entirety of divine activity, from the creation of the angelic beings to the last judgement. These activities of the Spirit are a further demonstration of his divine status.¹⁹⁸ Particularly important is the fact that true knowledge of God the Father is acquired from the Spirit through the Son, whereas the characteristics of divinity (natural goodness and holiness, royal dignity) come to the Spirit from the Father through the Son. For

¹⁹² The two dates for this festival are both given by Basil. See *epp.* 176 (II, 113.12-19; *PG* 32.653B); 100 (I, 219.20-23; *PG* 32.505A). See also Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, p. 41.

¹⁹³ *Spir.* 1.3 (pp. 16.8-18.1; *PG* 32.72B-C). On Basil's use of these trinitarian doxologies, see Holl, *Amphilochius*, p. 142.

¹⁹⁴ The best treatment of the life and theology of Amphilochius is still Holl, *Amphilochius*, pp. 1-115, 235-263. For a brief treatment, see M.-M. Hauser-Meury, *Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz* (Theophaneia, no. 13; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1960), pp. 30-32.

¹⁹⁵ See *Spir.* 1.1-2 (pp. 13.10-16.7; *PG* 32.68A-72B); Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*; pp. 43,45; Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 46-52.

¹⁹⁶ *Ep.* 231 (III, 37.31-38.38; *PG* 32.861C). Cf. *ep.* 248 (III, 87.21-24; *PG* 32.929B).

¹⁹⁷ See *Spir.* 10.24 (pp. 56.1-58.14; *PG* 32.109D-112B); 10.26 (pp. 59.18-61.19; *PG* 32.113A-C); 12.28 (pp. 63.20-65.3; *PG* 32.117A-C); 13.30 (pp. 67.20-24; *PG* 32.121A); 17.43 (pp. 88.22-89.12; *PG* 32.145D-148A); 18.44 (pp. 90.5-91.12; *PG* 32.148C-149B).

¹⁹⁸ *Spir.* 16.38-40 (pp. 79.6-86.3; *PG* 32.136A-144A); 19.49 (pp. 98.131-00.17; *PG* 32.156C-160A); 24.56 (p. 112.1-19; *PG* 32.172C-173A).

Basil, these two statements comprise a confession of the inseparable unity within the Godhead as well as the co-equality of the three persons within it.¹⁹⁹ Further speculation, especially with regard to the mode of the Spirit's existence,²⁰⁰ is fruitless, for the being of the Spirit is inaccessible. The proper response to the knowledge learned about the Spirit from his activities is not speculation, but glorification: the confession of the glory common to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.²⁰¹

The Synod of Cyzicus in 376²⁰² put the finishing touch to the ecclesiastical gains made by the Pneumatomachi from 373 onwards.²⁰³ Under the leadership of Eustathius and Eleusius of Cyzicus,²⁰⁴ this synod re-affirmed that the Son was similar in being to the Father, and, according to Basil, took a blasphemous position with regard to the Spirit which was equivalent to that of Eunomius.²⁰⁵ Whether or not Basil's report about the confessional statement of this synod is accurate cannot be completely determined. Basil himself had not seen the statement, and his report is based on oral information. Moreover, Friedrich Loofs²⁰⁶ and Peter Meinhold²⁰⁷ have regarded the mention of Eunomius as mere polemical disparagement. Yet, since Basil's statement in *ep.* 244 is the only extant witness concerning the confessional stance of this synod

¹⁹⁹ *Spir.* 18.47 (pp. 94.17-95.22; *PG* 32.153A-C).

²⁰⁰ *Spir.* 18.46 (p.93.1-9; *PG* 32.152B).

²⁰¹ *Spir.* 24.55 (pp. 110.3-111.21; *PG* 32.169B-172C); 25.58-60 (pp. 113.18-117.28; *PG* 32.173C-180B); 27.68 (pp. 133.19-135.2; *PG* 32.193B-196B).

²⁰² For the date, see Tillemont, *Mémoires*, VI, 601; Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 17-18; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 206-207. Chadwick ("Literarische Berichte", p. 335) and Fedwick (*Charisma*, p. 148) place it in 375.

²⁰³ See Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 206-207.

²⁰⁴ On Eleusius, see pp. 177-179.

²⁰⁵ *Ep.* 244.9 (III, 83.20-24; *PG* 32.924B). Cf. *ep.* 244.5 (III, 79. 34-40; *PG* 32.920A). For Eunomius, the Spirit is a creature, created by the authority and command (*πρόσταγμα*) of the Father through the activity (*ἐνέργεια*) and power (*δύναμις*) of the Son [*exp. fid.* (*PG* 67.589B-C)]. Although the Spirit is not endowed with the creative power of the Son, he does possess as his own activity all the power of sanctification, which makes him unique among the creatures of the Son. Eunomius further argued that, since the Spirit is third in rank (*τάξις*) and honour (*ἄξιωμα*) he is third in nature (*φύσις*), for rank indicates nature. Thus, Eunomius rejected the concept of a "unique being in three persons" and advocated a hierarchy of being within the Trinity. The Father, the Son, and the Spirit are three different, and in no way equal, beings (*οὐσίαι*). The original being is the ingenerate and uncreated Father. For further discussion of Eunomius' pneumatology, see Michel Spanneut, "Eunomius de Cyzique", *DHGE*, XV (1963), 1402; Luise Abramowski, "Eunomios", *RAC*, VI (1966), 945; Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", pp. 50-53, 60-61; Anthony Meredith, "Orthodoxy, Heresy and Philosophy in the Latter Half of the Fourth Century", *HJ*, XVI (1975), 12; T.A. Kopecek, *A History of Neo-Arianism* (Patristic Monograph Series, no. 8; Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., 1979), II, 341-346.

²⁰⁶ *Eustathius*, pp. 17-18; 78, n.2.

²⁰⁷ "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1084. Cf. also Gerhard May, "Die Datierung der Rede 'In suam ordinationem' des Gregor von Nyssa und die Verhandlungen mit den Pneumatomachen auf dem Konzil von Konstantinopel 381", *VChr*, XXIII (1969), 50.

with regard to the Holy Spirit, the view of Loofs and Meinhold must be regarded as conjecture.²⁰⁸ What is clear is that Eustathius agreed to a confession of faith which permitted no consideration of the full divinity of the Spirit.²⁰⁹

Two immediate reactions to the pneumatological position of this synod were forthcoming from Basil and his disciples. The Synod of Iconium, held in 376 under the presidency of Amphilochius was the first.²¹⁰ A circle of bishops (probably from Lycaonia) had requested clarification of the issues in the current debate on the Holy Spirit.²¹¹ The reply came in the form of a synodal statement drawn up by Amphilochius. According to this statement, the association of the Spirit with the Father and the Son as an object of faith in the Nicene creed is sufficient proof of his divinity for the one who reads that creed with spiritual understanding. However, since Satan has caused many to doubt the Spirit's divinity, it is necessary to go back to the source of the faith, from which the Fathers at Nicaea created their confession.

[This source is] the tradition of the Lord, which, after his resurrection from the dead, was enjoined upon his holy disciples, and which commands, 'Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' [Mt 28:19]. It is clear that we have received the command not only to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, but to teach Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Thus, through this commandment, the sickness of Sabellius is also rejected when the three hypostases are handed down to us completely. The mouths of the Anomoeans, Arians and Pneumatomachi are also shut. The three persons and hypostases are clearly manifest, and the one nature and Godhead confessed. Therefore, it is necessary for us to baptize, as we have been taught; and to believe as we have been baptized; and to glorify, as we have believed. For we have taken various aspects into consideration and have examined them from every perspective, and still are able to conceive of nothing between the Creator and creature. If we separate the Spirit from the Godhead, he must be counted among the creatures. But if we dared to call him a creature, how could he be united [with Father and Son] in the baptismal formula? Thus we refute polytheism as well as atheism. We proclaim neither three sources, nor three gods, nor three different natures. Rather, we know of one source of the universe, the Father. Nor do we deny any of the three hypostases [of the Trinity] ...but in the doxologies glorify the Spirit together with the Father and the Son, and are aware of this: that those who commit the unforgivable sin,

²⁰⁸ Cf. Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 75.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 75. See also Loofs, *Eustathius*, pp. 17-18; Hauschild "Pneumatomachen", pp. 59, 206-207.

²¹⁰ Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1084; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 208. On the date of this synod, see Holl, *Amphilochius*, pp. 25-26, n. 2. Cf. Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 208.

²¹¹ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 171. Cf. Holl, *Amphilochius*, p. 26; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 208.

through the blasphemy against the Spirit, reject communion with the Arians to no avail, for they will be condemned with them.²¹²

When the Spirit is called a creature, he is separated from the Godhead. Yet, he cannot be a creature, for he is named together with the Father and the Son in the baptismal command of Mt 28:19. Furthermore, to confess the Spirit as an inseparable member of the Godhead does not entail tritheism; there is one Godhead in three Persons.²¹³ Thus the Spirit must be glorified together with the Father and the Son.²¹⁴ Those who refuse to glorify the Spirit are no better than Arians.²¹⁵ As Karl Holl²¹⁶ and Dörries²¹⁷ note, this synod, led by Amphilochius, has made Basil's mature teaching on the Spirit its own.

The second reaction came from Basil, who now recognized in Eustathius one of the most dangerous enemies of the Church. Consequently, in *ep.* 263, a letter sent to the western episcopate in 377, he wrote:²¹⁸

One of those who is causing us much grief is Eustathius of Sebaste in *Armenia prima*. After he had been excluded from the office of bishop because of his previous deposition at Melitene he thought that a journey to you would open a way to be restored [to his charge]. We do not know what the propositions were which were suggested to him by the most blessed bishop Liberius and to which he agreed. We know only that he returned with a letter restoring him [to his see], and that after he showed this letter to the synod at Tyana, he was reinstated to his see. This man is now endeavouring to destroy that creed on account of which he was received into communion. Moreover, he is united with those who anathematize the term 'one in being', and is the leader of the heresy of the Pneumatomachi. Since therefore his power to harm the churches comes from the West and since he uses the authority given to him by you for the overthrow of many, it is necessary that correction come from the West. Letters must be sent to the churches [indicating] why he was accepted, and how now, because he has been swayed, he nullifies the favour given to him at that time by the Fathers.

As P.J. Fedwick observes, Basil does not press for an immediate

²¹² *Ep. syn.* 3, 4 (pp.220.46-67, 221.84-88; *PG* 39.96C-97B-C). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 171-172.

²¹³ In addition to the other charges brought against Basil (see pp. 42-43), his opponents called him and his followers tritheists. See *ep.* 131.2 (II, 46.20-21; *PG* 32.568B); *hom.* 29 (*PG* 31.1488C-1493B). See also Holl, *Amphilochius*, pp. 142-147; Robert Melcher, *Der 8. Brief des hl. Basilios, ein Werk des Evagrius Ponticus* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, vol. 1; Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923), pp. 52-54; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 100, 158; Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 164, n.109.

²¹⁴ See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 173.

²¹⁵ See also Holl, *Amphilochius*, p. 26; Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 76.

²¹⁶ *Amphilochius*, p. 26.

²¹⁷ *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 172-173; "Basilios", pp. 140-141.

²¹⁸ *Ep.* 263.3 (III, 123.1-3, 22-124.37; *PG* 32.977B, 980A-B). See also Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 76. On the date, see Loofs, *Eustathius*, p. 39; Lietzmann, *Apollinaris*, p. 62; Mühlberg, *Apollinaris*, pp. 46, 47, 48.

condemnation of his old friend.²¹⁹ Instead, Basil requests that the bishops of the west issue a public denunciation of Eustathius' errors so that Eustathius would have the opportunity to repent. Moreover, Basil points out that if Eustathius chooses to hold fast to his erroneous teaching, then he has to realize that such an action would entail his exclusion from communion with the west. This is the last that is heard of Eustathius. He did not amend his ways, and it is generally held that he died shortly thereafter. He was certainly dead by 380, when the episcopal administration of Sebaste was assumed for a few months by Gregory of Nyssa, after which Basil's youngest brother, Peter, was installed as bishop.²²⁰ In the following year, 381, came the triumph of the Basilian doctrine of the Spirit when the third article of the Nicene creed was expanded by the Council of Constantinople. The theologians responsible for this expansion (chiefly Gregory of Nyssa) were clearly indebted to Basil's insights.²²¹

Although Basil would have agreed to a formal expansion of the third article of the creed, he would not have expressed himself in the same way as the council.²²² But, by this time, Basil was dead. He had died on 1 January, 379, and thus never witnessed the triumph of the pneumatological position for which he had fought for most of his episcopacy. His final recorded statement on the question was given in a letter written in 376 or 377²²³ to Epiphanius of Salamis, that "hot-headed heresy-hunter".²²⁴ Epiphanius had asked Basil to intervene in a doctrinal dissension over the question of the Spirit and Apollinarian christology at the monastic community on the Mount of Olives. Also the bishop of Salamis had desired Basil to write to the orthodox community at Antioch in the hope

²¹⁹ *Charisma*, pp. 111-113. See also *ibid.*, pp. 74, n. 170; 94-97.

²²⁰ S. Salaville, "Eustathe de Sebaste", *DTC*, V/2 (1939), 1571; Gribomont, "Eustathe", col. 32. On Peter, see also J.E. Pfister, "A Biographical Note: The Brothers and Sisters of St. Gregory of Nyssa", *VChr*, XVIII (1964), 110-111.

²²¹ See pp. 199-201. Ritter (*Konzil*, pp. 297-298, n.1) criticizes Dörries' suggestion that the "moderate" tone of the expanded third article of the Nicene creed is due to the influence of Basil's pneumatology. For Ritter, this "moderate" tone is due to the fact that the expanded third article was drawn up with the hope that it would win over the Pneumatomachi at the council, led by Eleusius of Cyzicus, to the orthodox position. However, these two reasons for the "moderate" tone of the expansion are not mutually exclusive. See Dörries, "Basilius", p.141, n. 28a.

²²² Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 174-175; *idem*, "Basilius", pp. 141-142; R.P.C. Hanson, "Dogma and Formula in the Fathers", *SP*, XIII (1975), 173; Reinhart Staats, "Die Basilianische Verherrlichung des Der Heilige Geistes auf dem Konzil zu Konstantinopel 381", *KD*, XXV (1979), 238-239. Basil, however, would not have agreed to the formulation of a new creed, which is what happened at Constantinople (Staats, "Basilianische Verherrlichung", p. 239).

²²³ See excursus III.

²²⁴ Dörries, "Basilius", p. 137.

that such a letter could bring the schism there to an end.²²⁵ With regard to the first request, Basil replies:²²⁶

We have already written to our beloved brothers at the Mount of Olives, our Palladius and Innocent the Italian,²²⁷ in reply to their letters to us. [We told them] that we are unable to add anything to the Nicene creed, not even the smallest addition, except the glorification of the Holy Spirit, because our fathers made mention of this part [of the faith] cursorily, since at that time no controversial question concerning it had yet arisen. But the doctrines [of Apollinaris] concerning the incarnation of the Lord which are being interwoven into that creed we have neither examined nor accepted because they are too deep for our comprehension. We are well aware that, when once we have violated the simplicity of the creed, we will find no end to our words, because the controversy will always lead us further, and with the introduction of unfamiliar phrases we will disturb the souls of the simpler [believers].

This passage is important for a couple of reasons. First, it provides, in summary form, the position that was reached in *Spir.* In *Eun.* 3 and his earlier letters Basil had expressed himself negatively with regard to the necessary explanation about the Holy Spirit: the creatureliness of the Spirit is to be rejected.²²⁸ Here, as well as in *Spir.*, a positive explanation is offered: the Spirit is to be glorified together with the Father and the Son.²²⁹ Second, Basil thinks that this explanation entails an expansion of the third article of the Nicene creed.

A few years later Basil's view in this regard received formal confirmation, when, at the Council of Constantinople in 381, it was stated as an article of faith that the Holy Spirit is "worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son."²³⁰ Moreover, the advice concerning the sufficiency of the second article of the creed provides a valuable insight into Basil's understanding of his own role in the doctrinal struggles of his time: namely, to lead the Church into a recognition of the divinity of the Spirit, but in such a way that the faith of simpler believers was not disturbed.²³¹

²²⁵ On this schism, see pp. 33-34.

²²⁶ *Ep.* 258.2 (III, 101.12-102.27; *PG* 32.949B-C).

²²⁷ On Palladius and Innocent, see pp. 31-32.

²²⁸ See pp. 25-26, 30-31

²²⁹ See pp. 44-45

²³⁰ *P.* 250.15-16.

²³¹ Mühlenberg, *Apollinaris*, pp. 52-53, 59. For further discussion of the significance of this passage from *ep.* 258, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 116-117, 168-169, 185-186; *idem*, "Basilius", pp. 137-138, n.32a; Hanson, "Dogma and Formula", p. 173; J.[J.] Verhees, "Mitteilbarkeit Gottes in der Dynamik von Sein und Wirken nach der Trinitätstheologie des Basilius des Grossen", *OS*, XXVIII (1978), 8-9.

EXCURSUS ONE

THE PNEUMATOLOGY OF DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

Although Dionysius had sat under Origen in the catechetical school of Alexandria, he was not, as W.A. Bienert has recently shown,¹ a devoted admirer of the Alexandrian scholar. Nonetheless, he was influenced by Origen in the formulation of his teaching on the Trinity. This is especially clear in his resistance to the propagation by some Libyans of the teaching of Sabellius, an exponent of a sophisticated form of modalistic monarchianism.² In his eagerness to resist this heresy, Dionysius so emphasized the distinctions within the Godhead that he was accused of tritheism by the Sabellians in a formal denunciation which was sent to Dionysius, bishop of Rome. Part of the bishop of Rome's reply was a letter to the church of Alexandria, in which the inseparability of the members of the Godhead was stressed. The Trinity does not consist of three absolutely separate beings (ὑποστάσεις) as the Alexandrian bishop seemed to maintain, but remains indivisibly one.³ However, there was a marked failure by Dionysius of Rome to grasp the concept of the distinct subsistence of each of the members of the Trinity, which his namesake had inherited from Origen.⁴

Replying to the charge of separating the Father and Son, Dionysius writes:⁵

Each of the names [of the persons of the Trinity] mentioned by me is inseparable and indivisible from the one which is next to it. I spoke of the Father, and before I introduced the Son, I already signified that he is in the Father. I introduced the Son. Even if I had not previously spoken of the Father, he would certainly have been presupposed in the Son. I added the Holy Spirit, but at the same time I added suitably, from whom and through whom he came.

¹ *Dionysius, passim*.

² Little is known about Sabellius. He arrived in Rome, *ca.* 217, and assumed the leadership of the modalist monarchians of that city. Shortly thereafter, he was excommunicated by Callistus, bishop of Rome. Reports of his teaching by fourth-century authors are to be found in Bernard Lonergan, *The Way to Nicea. The Dialectical Development of Trinitarian Theology*, trans. Conn. O'Donovan (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), pp. 38-39. See also Ernest Evans, ed. and trans. *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), pp. 12-15; the literature cited by Bienert, *Dionysius*, p. 215, n.65.

³ Grillmeier, *Christ*, I, 155-156.

⁴ Swete, *Holy Spirit*, p. 137; Grillmeier, *Christ*, I, 156.

⁵ Athanasius, *Dion.* 17.1-2 (p. 58.15-23; PG 25.504C-505A).

But they do not know that the Father is not estranged from the Son qua Father, for the name suggests such a unity, nor is the Son separated from the Father. For the designation "Father" makes the community [of being] clear. And in their hands (ἐν...ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν) is the Spirit, who cannot be parted from either him who sends [him] or him who conveys [him] (μῆτε τοῦ πέμποντος μῆτε τοῦ φέροντος). Therefore, how can I, who use these names, believe that they are completely (παντελῶς) divided and separated from one another?

The Alexandrian bishop makes it sufficiently clear that, in his rejoinder to the Sabellian partisans of the Libyan Pentapolis, he had no intention of setting forth tritheism.⁶ The very terms "Father" and "Son" imply the inseparable communion which exists between the first two members of the Trinity. As for the Spirit, his being "in the hands" of the Father and the Son indicates his inseparable relationship to the Father and the Son.⁷ According to Bolgiani,⁸ this expression indicates the difficulty which Dionysius has in thinking about the Spirit in a manner as personal as his reflections about the Father and the Son. Bienert,⁹ on the other hand, sees in it the influence of dynamic monarchianism. Whatever the precise import of this phrase, one fact is clear: the distinctions between the members of the Godhead are still prominent.¹⁰ Even the use of the adverb "completely" in the final sentence serves to qualify Dionysius' repudiation of the charge of tritheism.¹¹ As Basil reports in *Spir.* 29.72,¹² Dionysius, in this reply to his namesake, continued to maintain that a refusal to recognize the existence of three distinct members within the Godhead is tantamount to a denial of the Trinity. The same point is made in another fragment preserved by Athanasius. It reads:¹³

Therefore we expand the unity, without dividing it, into the Trinity and sum up the Trinity, without diminishing it, in the unity.

This dogged insistence upon the recognition of three subsistent entities within the Godhead is certainly related to the fact that Dionysius, despite his affirmation of the unity of the Godhead and the influence upon his trinitarian thought exerted by Tertullian's *Prax.*¹⁴ and by Dionysius of Rome, never fully succeeded in escaping the subordinationism which he

⁶ Bienert, *Dionysius*, p. 217.

⁷ Swete, *Holy Spirit*, p. 138.

⁸ "Esprit-Saint", p. 54, n.36.

⁹ *Dionysius*, p. 211 and n. 47.

¹⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 220; W.A. Bienert, "Das vornicaenische ὁμοούσιος als Ausdruck der Rechtläubigkeit", *ZKG*, XC (1979), 24.

¹¹ Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. 182, n. 5.

¹² Pp. 140.1-141.12; *PG* 32.201B-C.

¹³ *Dion.* 17.2 (p. 58.24-25; *PG* 25.505A).

¹⁴ See Karl Müller, "Kleine Beiträge zur alten Kirchengeschichte", *ZNTW*, XXIV (1925), 282-285; Evans, *Against Praxeas*, pp. 20,28-30. Cf. Bienert, *Dionysius*, p. 221.

had inherited from Origen. This is certainly the case with regard to his conception of the relationship between the Father and the Son,¹⁵ and probably also with regard to his understanding of the place of the Spirit in the Trinity.¹⁶

¹⁵ Grillmeier, *Christ*, I, 158-159. Cf. Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 138-139.

¹⁶ For a readable account of Dionysius' life, see E.R. Hardy, *Christian Egypt: Church and People. Christianity and Nationalism in the Patriarchate of Alexandria* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), pp. 18-32. For Dionysius' struggle with the Sabellians and his discussion with his Roman namesake, see Pollard, *Johannine Christology*, pp. 106-110; Barnard, "Antecedents", pp. 176-179; Bienert, *Dionysius*, pp. 200-221.

EXCURSUS TWO

THE DATE OF BASIL'S *DE FIDE*

W.K.L. Clarke, in his *St. Basil the Great: A Study in Monasticism*,¹ follows Prudent Maran² in giving 361 as the approximate date of *fid.*, although he admits that Maran's arguments are not very convincing. In a later work, Clarke argues that Basil's phrase "so we baptize"³ indicates that Basil was a presbyter when he wrote *fid.*⁴ This phrase however need not carry such an implication. Its context is as follows:

So we believe and so we baptize according to the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said, 'Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teach them to observe all that I have commanded you' [Mt 28:19-20].

Dörries⁵ has shown that the phrase "so we believe and so we baptize" is actually an early version of a statement which was a basic expression of Basil's own personal experience and theological thought. For Basil, Christ's baptismal command defines not only the form of the Church's baptismal formula, but also the nature of her confession of faith. Later, during the Pneumatomachian controversy Basil came to regard the Church's doxology as also determined by this command.

Dörries⁶ also argues that the composition of *fid.* lies at a time prior to Basil's episcopate. Chief among his reasons are: 1) *fid.* is characterized as Basil's first non-polemical work; 2) Basil gives a "private" creed in *fid.* 4,⁷ which is based wholly upon the Scriptures; but in *epp.* 140 and 175, in the midst of his struggle with the Pneumatomachi, Basil refuses to compose a creed. Even in *epp.* 113 and 114, before the actual struggle begins, Basil simply refers his readers to the Nicene creed; 3) neither mention nor allusion is made to the Pneumatomachi; 4) Basil speaks with

¹ For bibliographical data, see p. 27, n. 87.

² *Vita s. Basilii Magni* 7 (PG 29.xxix).

³ *Fid.* 4 (PG 31.688A).

⁴ *Ascetic Works*, pp. 15-16; 95,n.1.

⁵ *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 16,129,133-134; "Basilius", pp. 132.

⁶ *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 17-18. See also Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, *The 'Unwritten' and 'Secret' APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea* (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, no. 13; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), pp. 17-21.

⁷ PG 31.685A-688A.

of a bishop. Thus Dörries dates *fid.* shortly after *Eun.* 1-3 and before the discussions with the Pneumatomachi.⁸

Fedwick,⁹ on the other hand, argues for a much later date. *Fid.* was composed when “some of the ascetics living in Pontus and neighbouring Armenia requested from Basil a statement of his faith as a condition for remaining in communion with him after he broke off with their common teacher Eustathius” in 372-375. These monks had demanded a proof of Basil’s orthodoxy and fidelity to Scripture. Thus Basil, although reluctant to write a creed, gave way to the demands of the ascetics, and drew up a creed which is replete with Scripture and which carefully avoids non-Scriptural and technical terminology.

Although there is much to be said for the arguments of both Dörries and Fedwick, a date in the early years of Basil’s episcopate is probably preferable. *Pace* Dörries any comparison between *fid.* and *epp.* 140 and 175 with regard to the composition of a “private” creed is an argument only against placing *fid.* in the midst of the Pneumatomachian struggle. In *ep.* 105, before the actual struggle between Basil and Eustathius began, Basil felt free to give a “private” confession of faith which focuses upon the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, there is no reference to the Nicene creed in *ep.* 105. Prior to Eustathius’ unequivocal support for the Pneumatomachian cause, Basil did not hold back from composing a “private” creed when the situation demanded it. Later though, when he did not want to provide fuel for slander, Basil refused to compose a creed (*pace* Fedwick).

Although Dörries is correct in asserting that there is no mention of the Pneumatomachi in *fid.*, there is clear evidence that Basil has been attacked for a certain position, probably that with regard to the Spirit. In *fid.* 5 he writes:¹⁰

We have been reminded by your piety that we should explain these items [of faith] before concluding and make clear our thoughts about them both for you and through you for our brothers in Christ, to both your and their satisfaction in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We considered it necessary and incumbent upon us [to do so], in order that no one’s mind be blown here and there by the variation in the statements made by us on different occasions. [This variation stems from the fact] that we are always compelled to resist the theories introduced by those who are opposed to the truth. [Also] that no one be shaken by the opposition of those who wish to ascribe to us strange [ideas] or who even frequently attribute falsely to our doctrine their own [wicked] passions so as to mislead the simpler [believers].

⁸ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 18; “Basilius”, p. 130.

⁹ *Charisma*, pp. 149-150.

¹⁰ *PG* 31.689A-B.

From this text it is clear that *fid.* is written in the context of debate, though a debate of a different type than that of *Eun.* 1-3. Since there is wide agreement that Basil is writing *fid.* to a monastic community, it is very probable that the opponents he has in mind at this point are the monastic zealots mentioned in Gregory of Nazianzus' *ep.* 58 and in the two letters of Athanasius in defence of Basil.¹¹

Pace Fedwick's arguments, there is neither a mention of the Nicene creed, common to Basil's later writings,¹² nor a reference to the Pneumatomachian struggle. His belief that *fid.* was written for monastic communities loyal to Eustathius' ascetical theology is contradicted by a passage in *fid.* 5, where it is stated:¹³

Therefore, I implore and beg you to cease from meddlesome inquiry and unbecoming controversy about words, and to be content with the statements of the saints and of the Lord himself, to think on those teachings which are worthy of your heavenly calling and to 'conduct yourselves in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ' [Phil 1:27].

This seems hardly an appropriate exhortation for Eustathius' followers, many of whom were biblicists! The passage is understandable if it is seen as a warning to those orthodox zealots who were critical of Basil's prudent reserve with regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Therefore, as Gribomont asserts,¹⁴ *fid.* should be dated *ca.* 372, in that period of time when Basil came under fire from orthodox zealots within his own monastic communities.

¹¹ See pp. 31-33.

¹² See Gribomont, "Esotérisme", pp. 37-38.

¹³ *PG* 31.688D-689A.

¹⁴ *Histoire*, pp. 288-289; "Esotérisme", p. 37, n.69.

EXCURSUS THREE

THE DATE OF BASIL'S *HOM.* 24

Some scholars consider Basil's *hom.* 24¹ to be his final word on the question of the Spirit.² In the section of this homily devoted to the Spirit, Basil begins by denying the Sabellian assertion that the Spirit is identical with the Father and the Son. The Spirit is a person in his own right. This does not mean however, that the Spirit can be separated from the Father and the Son. The three members of the Trinity are indivisible. This indivisibility is demonstrated by the baptismal formula from Mt 28:19. Therefore, whoever divides the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son nullifies his own baptism and denies the traditional teaching about the Godhead that has been handed down from the Apostles.

Basil then takes up the question of the Spirit's mode of existence (τρόπος τῆς ὑπάρξεως). The Pneumatomachi reasoned that there were only three possibilities: unbegotten (ἀγέννητος), begotten (γεννητός) and creature (κτιστόν). Since there is only one who is unbegotten, the Father, and only one who is begotten, the Son, therefore the Spirit must be a creature. But, Basil retorts, to name the Spirit a creature alienates him from the Godhead and places him on the same level as men, servants in constant need of God's grace. This is madness! Why not, reasons Basil, confess ignorance as to the Spirit's mode of existence and declare that he proceeds from the Father ineffably (ἀρρήτως)? This conclusion draws on Basil's deeply held belief that there is a definite limit to man's knowledge of the Godhead and beyond this limit one should not go.³

C.F.H. Johnston⁴ believes that the promise made in *Spir.* 24.55⁵ to devote a special treatise (ἴδια πραγματεία) to enumerate the reasons for not considering the Holy Spirit a creature is fulfilled in this homily. This would mean that *hom.* 24 was given after the composition of *Spir.* in 374-375. Bernardi⁶ also places this homily in the final years of Basil's life. Bernardi notes that the fullness of the pneumatological exposition is

¹ PG 31.600B-617B.

² *Hom.* 24.4-7 (PG 31.608C-617B).

³ See pp. 143-147. See also Dörries' discussion of this homily, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 94-97.

⁴ *Holy Spirit*, pp. 111-112.

⁵ P. 111.18-26; PG 32.172C.

⁶ *Prédication*, pp. 87-88. See also Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 153; p. 350, n. 240.

quite striking in contrast to *hom.* 15,⁷ given in 372. According to Bernardi, the chief reasons for this change in Basil's public teaching is the disappearance of the threat posed by Valens' support of the Homoean party, after the death of the emperor on August 9, 378. This support would have been extended also to the Pneumatomachi after their alliance with the Homoeans in 375.⁸ This reason implies however that Basil's refusal to treat fully the question of the Spirit in public was rooted in ecclesiastical and political prudence. But, with regard to the reasons for Basil's prudent handling (οἰκονομία) of the doctrine of the Spirit there is no general agreement among scholars.⁹ In the light of this situation, such a reason as Bernardi proposes constitutes a flimsy basis upon which to base a dating of *hom.* 24. Another reason which Bernardi advances in support of a later date is the advanced nature of the trinitarian vocabulary used in *hom.* 24. The term "hypotasis" (ὑπόστασις) appears frequently, while "person" (πρόσωπον) is used five times and "to proceed" (ἐκπορεύεσθαι) twice.¹⁰

Dörries,¹¹ on the other hand, notes the close thematic relationship which exists between *hom.* 24 and *Spir.* 18. This leads him to postulate that either *hom.* 24 was the model for *Spir.* 18, or else they were composed at the same time. With regard to Johnston's hypothesis that *hom.* 24 was the πραγματεία mentioned in *Spir.* 24.55, Dörries notes that a homily can hardly be called a πραγματεία.¹² Furthermore, it is strange that there are few links between *Spir.* 24, which makes the promise of a further work, and *hom.* 24, which Johnston believes to be the fulfillment of this promise.

A possible solution to this problem of the chronological relationship between *hom.* 24 and *Spir.* may lie in Basil's treatment of the Spirit's

⁷ PG 31.464B-472B. However, on the date of this homily, see p. 150, n. 240.

⁸ See p. 41.

⁹ Much of the disagreement is rooted in the diverse interpretations of the meaning of the terms κήρυγμα and δόγμα in the thought of Basil. See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 121-128; Amand de Mendieta, "Pair", pp. 129-142; Benoît Pruche, "Δόγμα et κήρυγμα dans le traité *Sur le Saint-Esprit* de Saint Basile de Césarée en Cappadoce", *SP*, IX (1966), 257-262; Dörries, "Basilius" pp. 128-131; Gribomont, "Esotérisme", pp. 43-48, 56; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 67-76; Gribomont, "Intransigence", *passim*.

¹⁰ But, note should be taken of the fact that all of these terms can be found in letters dating from 373 to 375. For ὑπόστασις, see, for instance, *ep.* 125.1 (II, 31.22-32.46; PG 32.545C-548B); 210.3.5 (II, 192.15-17, 196.34-46; PG 32.772B, 776C-777A); 214.3-4 (II, 204-206; PG 32.788B-789C); 226.4 (III, 28.17; PG 33.849C); for πρόσωπον, see *ep.* 52.3 (I, 135.1-136.6; PG 32.393C); 214.3 (II, 204, 18-205.33; PG 32.788C-789A); for ἐκπορεύεσθαι, see *ep.* 125.3 (II, 34.32-34; PG 32.549C).

¹¹ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 96.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 97.

mode of existence in these two texts. In *hom.* 24.7¹³ Basil simply affirms that the Spirit proceeds ineffably from God. In *Spir.* 18.46¹⁴ Basil elaborates on this statement: the Spirit proceeds ineffably from God as the breath of his mouth. Does this elaboration indicate the chronological priority of *hom.* 24? Of course, the difference between these two treatments may reflect the different audiences to which *hom.* 24 and *Spir.* were directed. The latter was a treatise destined to be read by those who were spiritually mature, while the former was a homily given to his flock. However, Dörries¹⁵ notes that this homily does presuppose a fair amount of dogmatic understanding. Moreover, as *hom. in Ps.* 32.4 shows,¹⁶ Basil was not reticent to proclaim publicly his conception of the Spirit's procession from the Father as the breath of his mouth. This homily, given *ca.* 375,¹⁷ treats the Spirit's mode of existence in a manner nearly identical to that in *Spir.* 18.46.¹⁸ Thus, the treatment in *Spir.* 18.46 may well represent a later elaboration of that in *hom.* 24.7. The question of the chronological relationship between *hom.* 24 and *Spir.* cannot be pursued further at this point, but surely it merits a special study.

¹³ *PG* 31.616B-C.

¹⁴ *P.* 93.1-9; *PG* 32.152B. For further discussion, see pp. 145-147.

¹⁵ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 97

¹⁶ *PG* 29.333B-C.

¹⁷ See Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 148.

¹⁸ For further discussion, see pp. 143-147.

CHAPTER TWO

ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

1. Epistulae iv ad Serapionem

Athanasius' letters to bishop Serapion of Thmuis comprise the main source for his doctrine of the Holy Spirit.¹ For in them, the incidental references to the Spirit in his earlier writings are developed, expanded, and supplemented. This is done so brilliantly that it is no exaggeration to say that the subsequent development of the dogma of the Holy Spirit was decisively influenced by them.² Furthermore, some scholars have recently emphasized that these letters are not only an important source for Athanasian pneumatology, but are also of great importance for Athanasius' theology as a whole.³

They were written by Athanasius from a desert refuge during his third exile.⁴ The traditional date for the letters is 358-359, which has been supported by most recent scholars.⁵ The four letters are in reality only

¹ Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II, 227; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p.51.

² Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II, 279; John McIntyre, "The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought", *SJT*, VII (1954), 354; T.C. Campbell, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius", *SJT*, XXVIII (1974), 408.

³ Dietrich Ritschl, *Athanasius. Versuch einer Interpretation*. (Theologische Studien, vol. 76; Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1964), pp. 52-53; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 51.

⁴ *Ep. Serap.* 1.1 (PG 26.529A); 1.33 (PG 26.605C). See also Saake, "Pneumatologisches Programm", p. 190, n.14.

⁵ Lebon, *Lettres*, pp. 49-50; Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 16-18; Quasten, *Patrology*, III, 57; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 30, n.3; Saake, "Pneumatologisches Programm", p. 188, n.2; Martin Tetz ("Athanasius", p. 344) places the first and second letters in 357-358, and the third (*ep. Serap.* 4.1-7) he thinks may have been written in 358-359. He gives no reasons for his dating. Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", p. 16) also considers 357 to be the *terminus a quo* for the letters. Yet, Athanasius clearly states in *ep. Serap.* 1.1 (PG 26.529A): "Your sacred kindness' letter was delivered to me in the desert" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 58). As Shapland (*Letters*, pp. 16-17) points out, Athanasius was in hiding in Alexandria from 357-358, and did not leave the city for the desert until late in 358 (see also p. 19 and nn.47, 48). The *terminus a quo* must therefore be late 358. Hauschild's criticism ("Pneumatomachen", p. 16, n.2) of Shapland's belief that 360 is the *terminus ante quem* is justified. Epiphanius [*haer.* 73.26.7 (p.301.5; PG 42.453 B-C)] reports that a certain Ptolemaeus was present at the synod of Seleucia in 359 as the bishop of Thmuis. If this report is correct, and there seems no reason to doubt it, then Serapion was either dead or deposed. The latter is more likely (for evidence, see Shapland, *Letters*, p. 16; Dörries, "Serapion", col. 1261). If he was deposed, then it is doubtful, as Hauschild points out, that he, as a church leader, could have held discussions with the Pneumatomachi. It is thus very likely that the letters to Serapion were written in late 358-359.

Reinoud Weijenborg ["De authenticitate et sensu quarundam epistularum S. Basilio

three, since the second and the third were originally one.⁶ Alfred Stülcken has further argued that the fourth letter is composed of two separate items.⁷ Stülcken believes, on the basis of the manuscript tradition, that the third reply to Serapion (that is, the fourth letter) originally comprised only sections 1-7. Sections 8-23, an exposition of Mt 12:32, are to be regarded, in Stülcken's view, as a separate work. His thesis has been advocated by Joseph Lippl,⁸ Otto Bardenhewer,⁹ Gustave Bardy,¹⁰ H.-G. Opitz,¹¹ Shapland,¹² Johannes Quasten,¹³ G.A. Egan,¹⁴ and most recently by Johannes Roldanus¹⁵ and M. Geerard.¹⁶ On the other hand, Joseph Lebon,¹⁷ in his translation of the letters to Serapion, and Helmut Saake¹⁸ have attempted to defend the unity of these two pieces. Laminski, who does not explicitly argue for the unity of *ep. Serap.* 4.1-7 and 4.8-23, also seems to regard them as one work.¹⁹ Yet, both the manuscript tradition and the internal criteria weigh heavily against their arguments.²⁰ Therefore, although a final decision can be reached only

magno et Apollinaris Laodicens adscriptarum", *Ant*, XXXIII (1958), 403, n.4] believes that the letters could not have been written before 363. In fact, Weijenborg questions whether all of the letters are authentic. However, Johannes Roldanus [*Le Christ et l'homme dans la théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, vol. 4; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), p. 389] shows that Weijenborg's arguments are not very well founded.

⁶ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 86.

⁷ *Athanasiana. Literatur- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 19; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899), pp. 58-60.

⁸ *Des heiligen Athanasius. Ausgewählte Schriften* (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, vol. 13; Munich: Verlag der Jos. Kölschen Buchhandlung, 1913), I, 399-400. Lippl regards *ep. Serap.* 4.8-23 as indeed a letter to Serapion but one which was written at a later date than the three letters about the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

⁹ *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (1923 ed.; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962), III, 71.

¹⁰ "Athanase (Saint)", *DHGE*, IV (1930), 1333.

¹¹ *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. 23; Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1935), p. 163.

¹² *Letters*, pp. 11-12.

¹³ *Patrology*, III, 58. Quasten surmises that *ep. Serap.* 4.8-23 was written to Serapion prior to the crisis precipitated by the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis.

¹⁴ *The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop Serapion of Thmuis concerning the Holy Spirit* (Studies and Documents, vol. 37; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968), pp. ix-x.

¹⁵ *Christ*, pp. 390-391.

¹⁶ "Athanasius Alexandrinus" in his *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974), II, 14.

¹⁷ *Lettres*, pp. 32-39. See also *idem*, "Comptes rendus: C.R.B. Shapland, *The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit*", *RHE*, XLVII (1952), 220.

¹⁸ "Beobachtungen zur Athanasianischen Pneumatologie", *NZSTR*, XV (1973), 356-359.

¹⁹ *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 98 and n.27. But, see *ibid.*, p.94, n.1. Cf. also Saake, "Athanasianischen Pneumatologie", pp. 358-359 and n. 53.

²⁰ Egan, *Armenian Version*, pp. ix-x; Roldanus, *Christ*, pp. 390-391. The significant internal criteria are: 1) Athanasius never so much as mentions or even alludes to his

after that manuscript tradition which transmits the two pieces as a unit is extensively examined,²¹ *ep. Serap.* 4.8-23 will not be used as primary evidence for the investigation of Athanasius' exegesis in his reply to the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis.

The first letter opens with Athanasius sharing his initial reactions to Serapion's information about the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis: he felt despondent and would have remained silent, were it not for the fact that he felt a pastoral responsibility to reply to the "diabolical foolhardiness" of the Pneumatomachi at Thmuis.²² The Alexandrian bishop then proceeds to answer the arguments which Serapion had described as basic to the position of the Pneumatomachi. First, in sections 3-14, Athanasius deals with the two Scriptures to which his opponents principally appeal, namely Am 4:13 and 1 Tim 5:21.²³ Then, in sections 15-21, he considers another argument which is based upon the relationship between the members of the Godhead. His opponents suggest that if it is maintained that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, then he must be a "second" Son. On the other hand, if it is held that the Spirit is dependent upon the Son, then he must be an offspring of the Son and the Father must be the Spirit's grandfather. Since the Spirit is obviously neither a "second" Son nor a grandson, then, the Pneumatomachi conclude, he must be a creature.²⁴

Athanasius' initial answer to this argument is an insistence upon the impenetrable mystery of the inner life of the Godhead. It is sufficient to know that the Scriptures call the Spirit of the Father neither "Son" nor "grandson" but "Spirit of the Son". This linguistic practice is taken to indicate the unity of the Godhead, and as such rules out the third possibility suggested by the Pneumatomachi, that the Spirit is a creature. If the Spirit were a creature, he would never be named together with the Father and the Son. "Here the cherubim spread the covering of their

Pneumatomachian opponents from Thmuis; rather his arguments are directed against the Jews and the Arians [*ep. Serap.* 4.22 (PG 26.673B-C)]. 2) More importantly, Athanasius' interpretation of Mt 12:32 in *ep. Serap.* 4.8-23 is quite different from that in *ep. Serap.* 1-4.7. In the latter, Athanasius applies Mt 12:32 to the Tropici [*ep. Serap.* 1.2 (PG 26. 536A); 1.33 (PG 26. 608B); 3.7 (PG 26.525D-637A)]; but in *ep. Serap.* 4.8-23 the same verse is interpreted as the blasphemy against the divine nature of the Son [*ep. Serap.* 4.17 (PG 26.661C-664B); 4.19 (PG 26.665B-C); 4.20 (PG 26.668B-669C)].

²¹ Martin Tetz, "Zur Edition der dogmatischen Schriften des Athanasius von Alexandrien", *ZKG*, LXVII (1955-1956), 24.

²² *Ep. Serap.* 1.1 (PG 26.529A-532B). See also Saake, "Pneumatologisches Programm", pp. 191-192.

²³ PG 26.536A-565C. On the interpretation of Am 4:13 by the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis, see H.R. Smythe, "The Interpretation of Amos 4¹³ in St. Athanasius and Didymus", *JTS*, n.s. I (1950), 158-168; Heron, "Theologie", pp. 3-24.

²⁴ *Ep. Serap.* 1.15,17 (PG 26.565C-568A, 569C). See also p. 68 n. 62.

wings” so as to prevent further inquiry into the nature of the Spirit. It is sufficient to know that the Godhead is indivisible and that the Spirit is not a creature.²⁵

Athanasius pursues this question of the Spirit’s nature further in sections 21-27 with an extensive examination of the Scriptures.²⁶ This inquiry is designed to show that the Spirit belongs to God and not to the creatures. In section 28 Athanasius appeals to the traditional teaching of the Church regarding the triune God,²⁷ and in sections 29-30 he probes the disastrous consequences of a concept of God in which no account is taken of the Spirit.²⁸ The first letter concludes with more texts which indicate the unity of the Godhead.²⁹

Apparently, the orthodox community at Thmuis found this first letter somewhat lengthy for their purposes and through Serapion requested an abridged version.³⁰ Athanasius complies, but not exactly in the manner suggested by the bishop of Thmuis. The first section of the letter, *ep. Serap.2*, is actually a tract on the doctrine of the Son. As Athanasius explains in *ep. Serap.3.1*, true knowledge of the Spirit can be developed only on the basis of true knowledge of the Son.³¹ What follows in the second section, *ep. Serap. 3*, is an abridgement of *ep. Serap. 1.22-31*, with no attempt being made to summarize the argument of *ep. Serap. 1.1-21*.³²

A third letter was required when Serapion informed Athanasius that the Pneumatomachi at Thmuis were continuing to maintain their views, especially making use of the argument which Athanasius had answered in *ep. Serap. 1.15-21*, but which he had neglected to mention in his second letter. Accordingly, Athanasius pens a third letter, which, although indebted to *ep. Serap. 1.15-21*, is actually an independent treatment of the subject covered in those sections.³³

In the following examination of the letters to Serapion the translation which is used is that of Shapland. Wherever revisions have been made, this is indicated in the footnotes. Although his translation is not based on a definitive critical text,³⁴ Shapland did conduct a partial examination of

²⁵ *Ep. Serap. 1.15-17* (PG 26.568A-569C).

²⁶ PG 26.581A-593C.

²⁷ PG 26.593C-596C.

²⁸ PG 26.596C-600A.

²⁹ *Ep. Serap. 1.30-33* (PG 26.600A-608B).

³⁰ *Ep. Serap. 2.1* (PG 26.608C-609A). See also Heron, “Theologie”, p.3.

³¹ PG 26.624C-625B.

³² Shapland, *Letters*, p. 169, n.1.

³³ Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 13; 179, n.1

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9. For Shapland’s discussion of the manuscript tradition, see *ibid.*, pp. 43-47.

the major manuscripts, and this led to at least sixty emendations of the text of the Benedictine edition of Bernard Montfaucon.³⁵

2. Athanasius as Exegete

Athanasius is a theologian steeped in the Scriptures.³⁶ Excellent testimony to this is his idealized account of Antony's method of studying the Bible.³⁷ This account probably reflects Athanasius' own way of study. Athanasius writes:³⁸

He paid such close attention to reading that nothing of what he read was forgotten, but everything was retained; and finally his memory served him instead of the books of the Bible.

Athanasius' devotion to the Scriptures was also well-known in his own day. For instance, Gregory of Nazianzus writes of Athanasius:³⁹

When he had achieved a familiarity with all of the Old and New Testaments such as no one else had achieved with even one of them, he was, on the one hand, rich in contemplation, and, on the other, rich in the glory of a good life.

His broad knowledge of the Scriptures served Athanasius in good stead in his controversies with the Arians and the Tropici. In the course of these controversies, Athanasius soon recognized that a literalistic approach to the Scriptures, i.e. a method which selects proof-texts at random, was not a satisfactory hermeneutic. Even the devil could support his arguments with such a method!⁴⁰ Rather, proper Scriptural exegesis presupposed an understanding of the central theme of the Bible, the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, and a life lived in obedience to that revelation. The Arian failure to understand this central theme, the σκοπός of Scripture,⁴¹

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 45. The text of the Benedictine edition of Montfaucon, which includes *ep.Serap.* 4.8-23, is reprinted in *PG* 26.529A-676C.

³⁶ According to G.L. Prestige [*Fathers and Heretics* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), p.67] Athanasius' "mind was saturated" with the Scriptures. See also E.P. Meijering, *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Synthesis or Antithesis?* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 114-116; Charles Kannengiesser, "Athanasius and the Foundation of Traditional Christology", *TS*, XXIV (1973), 105, 106-107.

³⁷ On v. *Anton* as an idealization of Antony's life, see Hermann Dörries, "De vita Antonii als Geschichtsquelle" in his *Wort und Stunde*, I, 145-224. Cf. R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh, *Early Arianism—A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), pp. 131-159.

³⁸ *V.Ant.* 3. (*PG* 26.845A). See also Meijering, *Orthodoxy*, p. 115.

³⁹ *Or.* 21.6 (p. 120.8-10; *PG* 35.1088B). See Tetz, "Athanasius", p.334.

⁴⁰ *Ep. Aeg.Lib.* 8 (*PG* 25.556B); *Ar.* 1.8 (*PG* 26.25C-28A). See also Samuel Laeuchli, "The Case of Athanasius Against Arius", *CTM*, XXX (1959), 411-412.

⁴¹ There are a number of substantial investigations of Athanasius' understanding of the term σκοπός, when he uses it in regard to Scripture. Pollard ("Exegesis", pp. 422-425; see also *idem*, *Johannine Christology*, p. 186, n.3) argues that, for Athanasius, this term means "the general bearing or drift" of Scripture. In other words, Scripture must be interpreted by

resulted in the distortion of the Scriptures.⁴² On the other hand, Athanasius did not, in the defence of his views, resort to an extreme allegorism. Instead, he is, as Charles Kannengiesser notes, the pioneer of “dogmatic exegesis”, in which his argumentation proceeds directly from those passages of Scripture which are central to his position.⁴³ Since this is the case, Dietrich Ritschl’s description of his exegesis as “un-Alexandrian” is correct.⁴⁴ This assertion does not mean that Athanasius never employs allegorical or figurative interpretations,⁴⁵ but that allegory is never the dominant method in his exegesis. This judgment is especially applicable to his dogmatic works.

Laminski observes that Athanasius usually conducts his discussion of the Arian position by means of a methodical analysis which has a dual aim: 1) the discovery of the “core” of his opponents’ arguments; 2) the demonstration of its absurdity, so that the orthodox position may thereby be clearly manifested as right.⁴⁶ A principal aspect of this analysis, especially in *Ar.* 1-3, is the use of the above-mentioned “dogmatic exegesis”, by which Athanasius “properly” interprets those key verses

Scripture: before any doctrinal conclusions can be drawn from an isolated passage, the “general drift” of Scripture must be taken into account. H.-J. Sieben (“Hermeneutique de l’exégèse dogmatique d’Athanasie” in Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie*, pp. 205-214) sharply disagrees with Pollard. Sieben begins by examining Origen’s use of the term. For Origen, Scripture does not immediately present a σκοπός to the reader. It is the Holy Spirit who communicates the σκοπός of Scripture, and this consists in the revelation of “hidden mysteries”. Thus, the true σκοπός of Scripture is veiled by the letter of Scripture (*ibid.*, p. 209). Athanasius, according to Sieben, derives his understanding of this term from Origen. There is however one fundamental difference between the two authors: the σκοπός of Scripture does not, for Athanasius, reveal a number of mysteries, as it did for Origen. Rather, Athanasius sees the σκοπός of Scripture as the announcement of one mystery: the two modes of the Son’s existence, the pre-existent Logos and the Incarnate One. Therefore, the proper interpretation of any passage from Scripture must be determined on the basis of whether it refers to the pre-existent Logos or the Incarnate Son (*ibid.*, pp. 210-214). M.B. Handspicker’s statement that the σκοπός of Scripture for Athanasius is its testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ [“Athanasius on Tradition and Scripture”, *ANQ*, n.s., III (1967), pp. 21, 24-25, 27] seems to agree with Sieben’s position. Handspicker further points out that σκοπός has not only intellectual, but also moral, overtones in the Athanasian corpus. This σκοπός can be apprehended only when the exegete’s life is a “living in communion” (σύζησις) with the saints who wrote the Bible. Handspicker’s point is well expressed by *inc.* 57(p.274.5-7; *PG* 25.196C): “without a pure mind and a life modelled on the saints, no one can apprehend the words of the saints” [trans. R.W. Thomson, *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 275]. Finally, Meijering (*Orthodoxy*, p. 93) also concurs with Sieben’s analysis, when he writes that, for Athanasius, the σκοπός of Scripture refers to the person of Christ.

⁴² See, for instance, *ep. Serap.* 2.7 (*PG* 26.620A-C).

⁴³ “Traditional Christology”, pp. 110-111.

⁴⁴ *Athanasius*, pp. 27-28. For instance, the allegorical exegesis of Didymus the Blind could be compared with that of Athanasius (Kannengiesser, “Traditional Christology”, p. 110).

⁴⁵ See pp. 67-68, n. 60.

⁴⁶ *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 38. Cf. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 162, n. 2.

used by his opponents, as well as those passages important to his own argument.

This procedure is also followed in the letters to Serapion. The introductory remarks of the first letter not only attack the Pneumatomachian exegesis of Am 4:13 and 1 Tim 5:21, but also set forth Athanasius' own position, which he will deepen as he reflects upon the Scriptures.⁴⁷ Common to the Pneumatomachian exegesis of Am 4:13 and 1 Tim 5:21 is the belief that the Holy Spirit is a creature.⁴⁸ From their exposition of 1 Tim 5:21, the Tropicici further contended that the Holy Spirit was the head of the angelic hierarchy.⁴⁹ Athanasius' refutation of his opponents' exegesis first takes note of the belief that is central to their argument: the Spirit is a creature.⁵⁰ Then, in *ep. Serap.* 1.2, he proceeds to indicate briefly the absurd implications of such a position. Athanasius writes:⁵¹

We might well wonder at their folly, inasmuch as they will not have the Son of God to be a creature— indeed, their views on this are quite sound! How then have they endured so much as to hear the Spirit of the Son called a creature? Because of the oneness of the Word with the Father, they will not have the Son belong to things originated, but rightly regard him as Creator of things that are made. Why then do they say that the Holy Spirit is a creature, who has the same oneness with the Son as the Son with the Father? Why have they not understood that, just as by not dividing the Son from the Father they ensure that God is one, so by dividing the Spirit from the Word they no longer ensure that the Godhead in the Triad is one, for they tear it asunder, and mix with it a nature foreign to it and of a different kind, and put it on a level with the

⁴⁷ *Ep. Serap.* 1.1-2 (PG 26.529A-533C).

⁴⁸ The Tropicici maintained that Am 4:13 (LXX) clearly asserts that the Spirit is a creature, for there God says: "I am he that establishes thunder and creates spirit (πνεῦμα) and declares to men his Christ" [*ep. Serap.* 1.3 (PG 26.536A)]. The Tropicici further insisted that the mention of Christ in this text logically implies that πνεῦμα refers to the Holy Spirit [*ep. Serap.* 1.9 (PG 26.552B)]. See also Heron, "Theologie", pp. 3-24. On 1 Tim 5:21, see n. 49 below.

⁴⁹ 1 Tim 5:21 is first mentioned by Athanasius in *ep. Serap.* 1.10 (PG 26.556B-C). There, he writes of his opponents' exegesis: "The Tropicici, in their own words, have dared to devise for themselves tropes (τρόπους) and to pervert also the saying of the Apostle, which he blamelessly wrote to Timothy, saying: 'I charge you in the sight of God and Christ and the elect angels that you observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality' [1 Tim 5:21]. But they say that, because he mentioned God and Christ and then the angels, the Spirit must be counted with the angels, and belong himself to their category, and be an angel greater than the others" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 86, revised). The Tropicici seem to have understood the phrase "elect angels" as a comprehensive figure of speech that included the Holy Spirit, since the Spirit is not mentioned separately. See also *ep. Serap.* 1.13 (PG 26.561B); Theodor Schermann, *Die Gottheit des Der Heilige Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Strassburger theologische Studien, vol. 4; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung, 1901), p.52; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 53,63; Hauschild "Pneumatomachen", p. 26.

⁵⁰ *Ep. Serap.* 1.1 (PG 26.529A-532A): "You write...that certain persons...oppose the Holy Spirit, saying that he is not only a creature, but actually one of the ministering angels, but differs from the angels only in degree" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 59-60).

⁵¹ PG 26.532C-533B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 62-65.

creatures? On this showing, once again the Triad is no longer one, but is compounded of two differing natures; for the Spirit, as they have imagined, is essentially different. What doctrine of God is this, which compounds him out of Creator and creature? Either he is not a Triad, but a dyad, with the creature left over. Or if he be Triad—as indeed he is!—then how do they class the Spirit who belongs to the Triad with the creatures who come after the Triad? For this, once more, is to divide and dissolve the Triad. Therefore, while thinking falsely of the Holy Spirit, they do not think truly even of the Son. For if they thought correctly of the Word, they would think soundly of the Spirit also, who proceeds from the Father, and, belonging to the Son, is from him given to the disciples and all who believe in him.

Presented within this passage, which traces the implications of the Pneumatomachian position, is the foundation of Athanasius' argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit.⁵² First, the Spirit has a relationship of unity with the Son analogous to, but not identical with, that of the Son with the Father.⁵³ Therefore, if the Son is considered uncreated, then the Spirit also has to be uncreated; any argument for the creatureliness of the Spirit is at once an argument for the creatureliness of the Son. Second, the Godhead, which exists in Trinity, is an indivisible unity. The assertion that the Spirit is a creature entails the destruction of this perfect unity, and furthermore, nullifies God's work of salvation and sanctification which is rooted in this unity.⁵⁴

These theological principles certainly determine the questions which Athanasius asks of the Scriptural text, and thus, they provide the framework of his Scriptural exegesis. But this delimitation does not mean that they determine the exact content of this exegesis. Athanasius is an attentive reader of the Scriptures,⁵⁵ and is well aware of the danger of twisting the texts to suit one's private opinion.⁵⁶ Thus, when the

⁵² See Shapland, *Letters*, p. 62, n.6; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 56-58. Saake ("Athanasianischen Pneumatologie", pp. 355-356; cf. *idem*, "Pneumatologisches Programm", pp. 197-198) finds the three essential aspects of Athanasius' theology of the Spirit to be the following: 1) the use of the triadic formulae of the Old and New Testaments; 2) the analogous relationships that exist between the Son and the Spirit on the one hand, and the Father and the Son on the other; 3) the formulation of the dogma of the Trinity.

⁵³ This ratio is termed the "co-relation principle" (*Korrelationsprinzip*). See pp. 84-85; 85, n. 158.

⁵⁴ This soteriological theme is intimated in the sentence: "For if they thought correctly of the Word they would think soundly of the Spirit also, who proceeds from the Father, and, belonging to the Son, is from him given to the disciples and all who believe in him." See Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 58.

⁵⁵ Thus, what Greer (*Origen*, p. 32) says of Origen, is also applicable to Athanasius. See also above pp. 63-64.

⁵⁶ Athanasius accuses the Arians of twisting the Scriptures in *Ar.* 1.37 (*PG* 26.88B-C). He writes: "But since they set up the divine oracles as a pretext, and force upon them a misinterpretation, according to their own understanding, it is necessary to answer them only so far as to vindicate these passages and to show that they have an orthodox meaning." Cf. *Ar.* 1.52 (*PG* 26.121A-B). In like fashion the Tropici are charged with perverting the written

controversy over the divinity of the Spirit flared up, Athanasius did not simply repeat statements about the Holy Spirit from his earlier works.⁵⁷ He conducted a fresh and thorough examination of the Scriptures,⁵⁸ and gave Serapion what he considered to be a faithful interpretation of the traditional teaching of the Church about the Trinity and the Holy Spirit.⁵⁹

In what follows, Athanasius' argument for the divinity of the Holy Spirit, insofar as it is coupled with the exegesis of the Corinthian correspondence, is examined with regard to: 1) Athanasius' concern to indicate the proper way to approach theology; 2) the use of 1 Cor 12:13 and 10:4 to extend the illustration of fountain-river to the Spirit, and so establish the Spirit's propriety to the Son; 3) the concordance of a number of texts (including 1 Cor 2:11-12, 12:11 and 13, 6:11, 2 Cor 2:15, 1 Cor 3:16-17) in a comparison between the Spirit and the creatures which demonstrates the Spirit's uncreated nature, and by inference, ensures the Spirit's rightful place in the Trinity; and 4) the use of Scripture (1 Cor 12:4-6, 2 Cor 13:13, 3) to explicate the orthodox concept of the Spirit as a full member of the Trinity.

3. *The Incomprehensibility and Ineffability of God*

Athanasius devotes the initial sections of the first letter to Serapion to a detailed answer to the Pneumatomachian exegesis of Am 4:13⁶⁰ and 1

Word of God so as to suit their opinions. See *ep. Serap.* 1.10 (PG 26.556B-C); 1.21 (PG 26.580C-581A); 1.32 (PG 26.605A-B). For further discussion, see Pollard, "Exegesis", pp. 416-418, *idem*, *Johannine Christology*, pp. 152-153, 161, 186-187. For a criticism of Pollard's viewpoint, see R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh, "The Centrality of Soteriology in Early Arianism", *ATR*, LIX (1977), 273-274; Groh, "Changing Points of View", pp. 460-461.

⁵⁷ This is the case despite the fact that Athanasius' position on the Holy Spirit may be found *in nuce* in *Ar.* 1-3.

⁵⁸ This is easily confirmed by a glance at the concordance of Scriptural texts in Müller's *Lexicon*, cols. 1635-1664. The overwhelming majority of the key texts from the Corinthian correspondence which are used in *ep. Serap.* 1-4.1-7 are not cited by Athanasius in any other work.

⁵⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.33 (PG 26.605C-D): "In accordance with the Apostolic faith delivered to us by tradition from the Fathers, I have delivered the tradition, without inventing anything extraneous to it. What I learned, that have I inscribed conformably with the holy Scriptures; for it also conforms with those passages from the holy Scriptures which we have cited above by way of proof" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 147-148). On Athanasius' view of the relationship between Scripture and tradition, see pp. 93-94.

⁶⁰ Athanasius' rejection of his opponents' exegesis of Am 4:13 is based upon an examination of the various meanings of "spirit" (πνεῦμα) in the Scriptures [*ep. Serap.* 1.4-6 (PG 26.536C-548B)], and a figurative interpretation of Am 4:13 which accords with the orthodox faith [*ep. Serap.* 1.9-10 (PG 26.552B-556B)]. During the examination of the possible meanings for πνεῦμα, Athanasius cites a large number of texts in support of his argument. His treatment of two texts from the Corinthian correspondence is interesting.

In *ep. Serap.* 1.6 (PG 26.545B) 2 Cor 3:17 is cited, possibly as a reference to the Holy

Tim 5:21, by means of which the Tropicici maintained that the Spirit is a creature of angelic nature.⁶¹ After Athanasius concludes this refutation, he turns to a question which the Tropicici raised concerning the relationships between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Athanasius cites their question in *ep. Serap.* 1.15:⁶²

They, persevering in their antagonism to the truth, as you write, speak again, no longer out of the Scriptures—they find nothing there—but proclaiming out of the abundance of their own heart: ‘If he is not a creature, nor one of the angels, but proceeds from the Father, then he is himself also a son, and he and the Word are two brothers. And if he is a brother, how is the Word only begotten? How is it then that they are not equal, but the one is named after the Father, and the other after the Son? How, if he is from the Father, is he not also said to be begotten or called son, but just Holy Spirit? But if the Spirit is of the Son, then the Father is the Spirit’s grandfather.’

Spirit. If this is the case, it would reveal an inconsistency in Athanasius’ understanding of the verse, for, in *Ar.* 1.11 (*PG* 26.36A), Athanasius refers the same verse to the Son (Shapland, *Letters*, p.75, n. 121; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 60, n.41). For a similar situation with regard to Basil’s exegesis of this verse, see pp. 153-156.

One of the Scriptural meanings of πνεῦμα which Athanasius mentions is that of the sense, as opposed to the letter, of the Scriptures [*ep. Serap.* 1.8 (*PG* 26.549B)]. The first verse that he cites in support of this is 2 Cor 3:6. The inclusion of the verse at this point in Athanasius’ argument would seem to indicate that Athanasius ruled out any possibility that τὸ πνεῦμα in the verse refers to the Holy Spirit (see Shapland, *Letters*, p. 78, n.1; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p.61). This is surprising for two reasons. First, other authors of the fourth century regarded this verse as an unequivocal affirmation of the lordship of the life-giving Holy Spirit. Second, the phrase τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ξωποιοεῖ, where πνεῦμα has the definite article, is an example of the principle which Athanasius gives in *ep. Serap.* 1.4 (*PG* 26.537A-C): where πνεῦμα occurs with the definite article, it nearly always refers to the Holy Spirit (see also Shapland, *Letters*, p. 78, n. 1). Why then does Athanasius interpret 2 Cor 3:6 in this manner? The reason is quite simple; he is following Origen’s exegesis of the verse in the latter’s *Comm. in Rom.* 6.11 (*PG* 14. 1092C), where Origen states: “Clearly the law of the spirit of life, which we said ought to be understood as the law of God, is that part by which the law is said to be spiritual. Thus he [Paul] adds: ‘the law of the spirit of life’. He could not have said this about the law of the letter, concerning which he announced elsewhere: ‘the letter kills’. This is called elsewhere: ‘the ministry of death’. Therefore the law contains both, the killing letter and the enlivening spirit” (trans. L.G. Bloomquist). See also Shapland, *Letters*, p. 78, n.1. K.H. Schelke [*Paulus. Lehrer der Väter* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1956), p. 264] states that, for Origen, the “law of the Spirit is equivalent to the spiritual understanding of the Old Testament Law of God”.

⁶¹ See p. 65 n. 49.

⁶² *PG* 26.565C-568A. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 95-98. Cf. *ep. Serap.* 4.1-7 (*PG* 26.637A-648B), where Athanasius treats this same question in greater detail. See also pp. 82-83. G.C. Stead [“Rhetorical Method in Athanasius”, *VChr*, XXX (1976), 133-135] believes that Athanasius, in his discussion of his opponents’ questions, is guilty of what he calls *reductio retorta*. The Pneumatomachian argument goes like this: if p (the Spirit is not a creature), then q (he is a Son, and he and the Word are two brothers). Yet, the Tropicici knew that q was false, thus they argued that p was also false and that therefore the Spirit was a creature. Confronted with this argument, Athanasius retorts: you Tropicici argue, if p then q; but since p is true, then you are arguing in favour of q. Athanasius thus saddles his opponents with the very belief they consider untenable. According to Stead, although Athanasius’ ideas are defensible, his method of argumentation in this particular instance is not. For Athanasius’ similar misleading presentation of the Arian position, see Gregg and Groh, *Early Arianism*, p. 102.

These questions, which Athanasius considers to be aspects of a bizarre joke, plainly reveal the refusal of the Tropici to accommodate a third element in the Godhead. The origin of the Spirit thus had to be linked with that of the created realm.⁶³ Athanasius, in his response to these questions, uses the Corinthian correspondence in two ways: in an *ad hominem* attack and as the indication of the proper way to approach theology.

The Tropici are “busybodies” who desire to search “the deep things of God” (1 Cor 2:10), which they should have realized were inaccessible to their evil curiosity.⁶⁴ The example of the Apostle Paul stands in contrast to the impudent inquiry of the Tropici. Athanasius writes:⁶⁵

For the things that have been handed down by faith ought not to be measured by human wisdom, but by the hearing of faith. What speech shall be able worthily to interpret the things that surpass originated nature? Or what hearing is able to understand things it is not lawful for men either to hear or to utter? [cf. 2 Cor 12:4]. For that is how Paul spoke of what he heard; but of God himself, ‘How are his ways past tracing out!’ and ‘who has known the mind of the Lord and who has been his counsellor?’ [Rom 11:33,34].

Athanasius’ allusion to 2 Cor 12:4 suggests that Paul’s attitude, not that of the Tropici, is the proper way to approach the traditional teaching about the Trinity: an attitude of faith that recognizes the inability of human wisdom ever to comprehend God.⁶⁶

The basic premise which undergirds this *ad hominem* use of the Corinthian texts is one that is common to the Greek patristic tradition: the knowledge of God as he is in himself always remains incomprehensible to man.⁶⁷ This premise sets the direction for Athanasius’ reply to

⁶³ Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, p. 18. See also Kretschmar, *Studien*, p. 13; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 54-55.

⁶⁴ *Ep. Serap.* 1.15 (PG 26.568A). See also *ep. Serap.* 3.2 (PG 26. 628A); Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 55-56.

⁶⁵ *Ep. Serap.* 1.17 (PG 26.572A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 104-105, revised. Cf. *ep. Serap.* 4.5 (PG 26.644B-645A).

⁶⁶ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 132.

⁶⁷ T.F. Torrance, “The Logic and Analogic of Biblical and Theological Statements in the Greek Fathers” in his *Theology in Reconstruction* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm.B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1965), p. 30. On the incomprehensibility of God in Athanasius, see J.B. Walker, “Convenance épistémologique de l’‘Homoousion’ dans la théologie d’Athanasie” in Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie*, pp. 255-275; Hanson, “Dogma and Formula”, p. 176. Maurice Wiles [*The Christian Fathers* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1977), p. 221] comments on this theme: “When the Fathers spoke of the ineffability of God, they were not doing themselves out of a job. ... The fact that we are unable to comprehend or to define properly the divine nature does not mean that we cannot say some things which may be of help towards an understanding of God’s character. There are times when our eyes cannot bear to look directly at the sun itself; they have then to infer its existence from the rays of light which reach us. So, though we are incapable of conceiving or describing the being of

the questions of the Tropici about the origin of the Spirit.⁶⁸ Their impertinent questions about what God is cannot be answered, for God's being cannot be comprehended by the human mind.⁶⁹ This does not mean that nothing can be known about God; by faith it can be known that he exists. So Athanasius writes in *ep. Serap.* 1:18:⁷⁰

You who are without sense and in all things reckless, why do you not rather cease your impertinent inquiries about the Holy Triad, and only believe that it exists? You have the Apostle as your teacher for this, when he says: 'It is necessary first to believe on God that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him' [Heb 11:6], He did not say 'how (πῶς) he is', but only 'that (ὅτι) he is'.

And previously in *ep. Serap.* 1.17:⁷¹

It is enough to know that the Spirit is not a creature, nor is he numbered with the things that are made. For nothing foreign is mixed with the Triad; it is indivisible and consistent. These things are sufficient for the faithful. Thus far human knowledge goes. Here the cherubim spread the covering of their wings.

The fact that the Holy Spirit is not a creature is sufficient knowledge for the believer. Since the intimate details of how he is divine are hidden behind the wings of the cherubim, such knowledge cannot be necessary.⁷²

After a discussion of the Biblical illustrations in *ep. Serap.* 1.20,⁷³ Athanasius returns to the questions of the Tropici. He writes:⁷⁴

Tradition, as we have said, does not declare the Godhead to us by demonstration in words, but by faith and by a pious and reverent use of reason. For if Paul proclaimed the saving Gospel of the Cross 'not in words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power' [1 Cor 2:4] and if in Paradise he heard 'unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter' [2 Cor 12:4]: who can declare the holy Triad itself? Nevertheless, we can meet this difficulty, primarily by faith and then by using the [Biblical] illustrations...

Tradition discusses the Godhead, not with a rationalistic approach

God himself, we can know him from his works, which stem from him like the rays from the sun. Such a view of the ineffability of God will not preclude theology altogether. It leads rather to a healthy recognition of the indirectness and the incompleteness which must always characterise every form of theological endeavour".

⁶⁸ On Athanasius' refusal to speculate about the origin of the Spirit, see p. 82-83.

⁶⁹ T.F. Torrance, "Athanasius: A Study in the Classical Foundations of Theology" in his *Theology in Reconciliation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1975), p. 237.

⁷⁰ PG 26.573A-B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 107. On the use of Heb 11:6 in this passage, see Greer, *Captain*, pp. 73, 126; Walker, "Convenance épistémologique", p. 259.

⁷¹ PG 26.569C. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 103-104. Cf. *ep. Serap.* 4.7 (PG 26.648A-B).

⁷² Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 140.

⁷³ For an examination of one of these illustrations, see pp. 71-76.

⁷⁴ PG 26.577B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 114-115.

devoid of mystery, but first with faith, and then with a reverent use of reason.⁷⁵ Paul's own example, a part of the tradition, indicates the proper attitude that must characterize any discussion of the Trinity. 1 Cor 2:4 reveals that his teaching did not depend upon mere words, but upon the faith and power of a Spirit-filled life. 2 Cor 12:4, to which allusion was made in *ep. Serap.* 1.17,⁷⁶ shows that ultimately God is incomprehensible and ineffable, for if such a one as Paul could not speak of what he heard in Paradise, who could possibly understand or speak about the Creator of Paradise? Nonetheless, Athanasius asserts, there is a proper way to discuss the Trinity: first, by faith, that is, through the faith of the Church that believes in a God who exists in an inseparable Trinity; second, through the illustrations from the Scriptures which provide the proper vehicle for a discussion of the Trinity.⁷⁷ Therefore, Athanasius offers his opponents a choice. Either uncritically accept the faith of the Church and believe that the Trinity is indivisible, and so, be silent. Or else, acknowledge what the Scriptures say about the Trinity,⁷⁸ and employ the various illustrations contained therein to discuss rationally the triune God.⁷⁹

4. The Illustration of Fountain-River-Draught

In the conclusion of the last section, it was noted that there were, according to Athanasius, two proper ways to speak about God: through the faith of the Church,⁸⁰ or through the illustrations (παράδειγματα) provided by Scripture. These Scriptural illustrations, in Athanasius' understanding, are analogies taken from the visible world so that through them the human mind may apprehend and discuss divine realities.⁸¹ It is a mistake to consider these illustrations as reality itself. As Athanasius writes in *hom. in Mat.* 11:27.3:⁸²

⁷⁵ On the relationship of faith and reason in Athanasius' thought, see Andrew Louth, "Reason and Revelation in Saint Athanasius", *SJT*, XXIII (1970), 385-396; Meijering, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 117-121.

⁷⁶ See p. 69.

⁷⁷ See pp. 71-76.

⁷⁸ *Ep. Serap.* 1.17 (PG 26.572B).

⁷⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.19 (PG 26.573B).

⁸⁰ See pp. 70-71.

⁸¹ Shapland, *Letters*, p. 108, n.3. See also Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Light of the World* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publ., 1962), pp. 21-31; Walker, "Convenance épistémologique", pp. 257-259, 261-263. For the instances of Athanasius' use of the term παράδειγμα, see Müller, *Lexicon*, cols. 1094-1095.

⁸² PG 25.216A. Trans. Pelikan, *Light*, p. 23.

In order to express our thoughts in language, it is necessary to make use of an unsatisfactory image (εἰκόνη πτωχή) taken from tangible and familiar objects; for it is rash to pry into the incomprehensible nature [of God].

The basic reason for the exegete's use of such illustrations lies in the paradox that, on the one hand, God's nature is ineffable and yet, on the other, the Biblical exegete must speak about God and his activity. The illustrations of Scripture supply the means whereby God's ineffability is preserved and his nature and saving activity proclaimed. In *ep. Serap.* 1.20 Athanasius explains the purpose of Scriptural illustrations as follows:⁸³

Divine Scripture, by way of relieving the impossibility of explaining and apprehending these matters [i.e. the nature of the Trinity] in words has given us illustrations (τὰ παραδείγματα)...that it may be lawful because of the unbelief of presumptuous men, to speak more plainly, and to speak without danger, and to think legitimately.

Yet, Athanasius insists that, despite the limitations inherent in these illustrations, they are not simply human conceptions (ἐπίνοιαι).⁸⁴ They are given to us by Scripture, and so correspond to the divine reality that has been revealed in Jesus Christ.⁸⁵ The rejection or misuse of these illustrations can only lead to false, perverse ideas (κακόνοιαι) about God.⁸⁶ But when they are properly employed, such illustrations not only curb rash speculation, but also provide a way to transcend the absurdities of literalism.⁸⁷

⁸³ PG 26.577B-C. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 115-116.

⁸⁴ Athanasius constantly reproaches the Arians and the Tropicists for using concepts and images fashioned by their own understanding; see *Ar.* 1.30 (PG 26.73A-76A); 2.36 (PG 26.224A-C); *ep. Serap.* 1.7 (PG 26.548B-C); 1.15 (PG 26.565C); 1.17 (PG 26.569C-572C). For further references, see Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 129, n.21.

⁸⁵ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 129-130; Walker "Convenance épistémologique", *passim*.

⁸⁶ *Ep. Serap.* 1.17 (PG 26.572B-C). So, in *ep. Serap.* 1.32 (PG 26.605B), Athanasius writes of the Tropicists: "in the words of the blessed Apostle, being 'natural men' [1 Cor 2:14], they could not receive the things of the Spirit of God, because these things were spiritually judged" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 147). T.F. Torrance ["Spiritus Creator: A Consideration of the teaching of St. Athanasius and St. Basil" in his *Theology in Reconstruction*, p. 227] writes: "one of the major lessons we learn from Athanasius and his attack upon Arians and semi-Arians alike is that unless we know the Holy Spirit through the objectivity of the *homoousion* of the Son in whom and by whom our minds are directed away from ourselves to the one Fountain and Principle of Godhead, then we inevitably become engrossed with ourselves, confusing the Holy Spirit with our own spirits, and confounding the one Truth of God with notions of our own devising".

⁸⁷ Pelikan (*Light*, p. 26) states that, for Athanasius, "biblical imagery revealed and concealed at the same time, thus protecting human speculation from the danger of going too far. By their very nature such images precluded a 'physical interpretation' ... Not, then, to paralyze reflective thinking, but to protect and simultaneously to stimulate it was the function of the images in Biblical language".

The first illustrations which Athanasius treats in *ep. Serap.* 1 are those of fountain (πηγή)-river (ποταμός), and light (φῶς)-radiance (ἀπαύγασμα).⁸⁸ The skilful arrangement of the Scriptural texts which attest to these illustrations, and to the others which Athanasius discusses, is governed by a set of theological premises which Athanasius poses as rhetorical questions in *ep. Serap.* 1.20:⁸⁹

If there is such co-ordination and unity within the Holy Triad, who can separate either the Son from the Father, or the Spirit from the Son, or from the Father himself? Who would be so audacious as to say that the Triad is unlike itself and diverse in nature, or that the Son is foreign to the being of the Father or the Spirit alien from the Son?

These questions, notwithstanding the fact that they appear as the conclusion of Athanasius' presentation of the Biblical illustrations, are actually the presuppositions which control the exposition of those Scriptures used in relation to the illustrations.⁹⁰ The Trinity is indivisibly one in being and so all the members of the Trinity coinhere in the divine activity (ἐνέργεια). 1 Cor 12:13, one of the two texts which Athanasius uses in *ep. Serap.* 1.19 to extend the illustration of fountain-river to the Spirit, is also employed to demonstrate the uniqueness of the Spirit in *ep. Serap.* 3.3-4. This latter use of 1 Cor 12:13 is examined below.⁹¹

The illustration of fountain-river is frequently employed by Athanasius to express the "full unbroken continuation of the being of the Father in the Son".⁹² Jer 2:13, 17:12-13 and Bar 3:10-12 showed that the Scriptures call the Father "a fountain" (πηγή).⁹³

⁸⁸ These two illustrations had been linked together quite early in Christian tradition. For instance, Hippolytus of Rome describes the relationship between the Father and the Son as "light out of light, or as water out of a spring" [*Noët.* 11.1 (p.71 PG 10.817C)]. For other references in the Fathers, see Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 108-109, n. 3; H.A. Wolfson, *Faith, Trinity, Incarnation*, Vol. 1 of *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (3rd ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 359-361. On Athanasius' use of the illustration light-radiance, see Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 37; 108-109, n. 3; Pelikan, *Light, passim*; G.C. Stead, *Divine Substance* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1977), pp. 263-264. For a provocative hypothesis concerning the origin of these two illustrations, see J.M. Ford, "The Ray, the Root and the River. A note on the Jewish Origin of Trinitarian Images" *SP*, XI (1972), 158-165.

⁸⁹ PG 26.576D-577A. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 113-114, revised.

⁹⁰ See Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 69.

⁹¹ See pp. 83-86.

⁹² Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. xxxii. Stead (*Divine Substance*, p. 263) notes that this illustration conveys the concept of organic continuity as well as that of one-way communication, for the river comes from the fountain, not *vice versa*. Furthermore, it serves to differentiate the Father from the Son. "There is no word which could denote the complex entity consisting of stream and fountain together; by speaking of *their* single *ousia*, St. Athanasius clearly refers to the water of which both are composed, and which flows from the former to the latter" (*ibid.*, p. 264).

⁹³ The Father is not only the source (πηγή) of the Son (Stead, *Divine Substance*, p. 261),

God is, and is called, fountain of wisdom and life, as is said through Jeremiah, 'They have forsaken me, the fountain of living water' [Jer 2:13]; and again, 'an exalted throne of glory is our sanctuary O Lord, the hope of Israel, let all who forsake you be ashamed; let them that have revolted be written on the earth because they have forsaken the Lord, the fountain of life' [Jer 17:12-13]. And in Baruch it is written, 'You have forsaken the fountain of wisdom' [Bar 3:13].⁹⁴

A fountain is a true fountain only when it has water issuing forth from it.⁹⁵ Thus, the eternal generation of the Son from the Father guarantees that the Father is a true fountain. Yet, when the Arians deny the eternal generation of the Son, they blaspheme the Father by implying that he is "a dry fountain" (πηγή ξηρά). So Athanasius writes in *decr.* 15.4:⁹⁶

[When the Arians] say, 'There was a time when he was not' and 'before his generation, Christ was not' ... [they declare that] the fountain has not begotten wisdom from itself, but has acquired it from outside itself, that they might boldly say, 'The Son came from nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων)'. For this shows that there is no longer a fountain but a certain pool (λάκκον), which, as it were, has received water from outside and has used the name of fountain.

And again in *Ar.* 1.14:⁹⁷

[When the Arians maintain that] 'there was a time when the Son was not', they

but also the source, the initiator, of all the divine activity that reaches the created realm. Thus Athanasius states in *ep. Serap.* 1.28 (PG 26.596A): "The Father does all things through the Word in the Holy Spirit. Thus the unity of the Holy Triad is preserved. Thus one God is preached in the Church, 'who is over all, and through all, and in all'—'over all', as Father, as beginning and fountain (ὡς ἀρχή, καὶ πηγή); 'through all', through the Word; 'in all', in the Holy Spirit" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 135, revised). See also *Ar.* 3.9 (PG 26.337C-340C); *ep. Serap.* 1.30 (PG 26.600B); V. Rodzianko, "'Filioque' in Patristic Thought", *SP*, II (1957), 302; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 82; 93, n.50. Pace Torrance, "Athanasius", pp. 252-253.

⁹⁴ *Ar.* 1.19 (PG 26.49C-52A). Cf. *decr.* 12.2 (pp. 10.27-11.4; PG 25.436C-D); 15.3 (p. 13.7-11; PG 25.441B). See also Charles Kannengiesser, "Le recours au *Livre de Jérémie* chez Athanase d'Alexandre", in Fontaine and his, eds., *EPEKTASIS*, pp. 319-320; Meijering, *Orthodoxy*, pp. 68-69.

⁹⁵ It is noteworthy that Athanasius does not cite, prior to *ep. Serap.* 1.19, a verse that names the Son as "a river" or "a stream". Rather, from Jer 2:13, 17:12-13 and Bar 3:12, he derives the description of the Son as "life" and "wisdom". Then he proceeds to argue that the Father was never "without life and wisdom". Cf. *Ar.* 1.19 (PG 26.49C-53A). Traces of this exegesis can be found in *ep. Serap.* 2.2-3 (PG 26.609B-612B). See n. 97 below.

⁹⁶ P. 13.13-17; PG 25.441B-C.

⁹⁷ PG 26.41C. Cf. *Ar.* 1.19 (PG 26.49C-52B); 2.2 (PG 26.149C); *decr.* 12.3 (p.11.4-14; PG 25.436D-437A); *ep. Serap.* 2.2 (PG 26.609B): "This opinion of the Arians is indeed mortal and corruptible. But the argument of truth, which even they ought to ponder, runs like this: If God is fountain and light and Father, it is not lawful to say that the fountain is dry or that the light has no ray, or that God has no Word; lest God be without wisdom, reason, and brightness" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 152). See also Georges Florovsky, "The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius", *SP*, VI (1962), 49-50; E.P. Meijering, "Athanasius on the Father as the Origin of the Son" in his *God Being History. Studies in Patristic Philosophy* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publ. Co., 1975), p.97.

rob the Word from God like thieves, and without disguise they speak against him that 'he was once' without his own Word and wisdom,... [that] the fountain was unfruitful and dry.

Here, in *ep. Serap.* 1.19, again according to Jer 2:13 and Bar 3:10-12, the Father is described as "a fountain".⁹⁸ By contrast, Ps 65:9 calls the Son "the river of God".⁹⁹ The Scriptures also state however that Christians drink of the Spirit.

As the Father is fountain and the Son is called river, we are said to drink (πίνειν) of the Spirit. For it is written: 'We are all made to drink (ἐποτίσθημεν) of one Spirit' [1 Cor 12:13]. But when we are made to drink (ποτιζόμενοι) of the Spirit, we drink (πίνουμεν) of Christ. For 'they drank (ἔπινον) of a spiritual rock that followed them and the rock was Christ' [1 Cor 10:4].¹⁰⁰

The use of this illustration in *ep. Serap.* 1.19 differs from its use in Athanasius' writings against the Arians. In the latter, it was employed as a description of the inter-trinitarian relationship between the Father and the Son. In the former, it is an illustration of the coinherence of the Spirit in the activity of the Son, and only indirectly a description of the inner life of the Trinity.¹⁰¹ 1 Cor 12:13, which uses the verb ποτίζειν, is interpreted in the light of 1 Cor 10:4, which employs the verb πίνειν. Athanasius either understands the two verbs to be synonymous, or else recognizes that the Bible can use different terms to express the same illustration. Thus Athanasius concludes: to drink (πίνειν/ποτίζειν) of the Spirit is to drink (πίνειν) of Christ.¹⁰² This extension of the illustration of fountain-river to the Holy Spirit can be described thus: fountain-river-draught.

In other words, in knowing the Spirit the believer comes to know the Son, who is within, not outside of, the Spirit. And, by implication, in knowing the Son the believer knows the Father. The experience of the believer can thus be used to describe the relationship of coinherence between the Spirit and the Father and Son.¹⁰³

Later, in *ep. Serap.* 1.20, Athanasius provides a hint that this extended illustration is of use in discussing the triune God. He writes:¹⁰⁴

⁹⁸ PG 26.573B-C.

⁹⁹ The exegesis of this verse is unique in the Athanasian corpus (Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 67, n.79).

¹⁰⁰ *Ep. Serap.* 1.19 (PG 26.573D-576A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 111-112.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Campbell, "Holy Spirit," p. 416.

¹⁰² Cf. Wiles, *Divine Apostle*, p. 92.

¹⁰³ See McIntyre, "Holy Spirit," p. 366.

¹⁰⁴ PG 26.577A,B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 114,115, revised. Cf. Campbell, "Holy Spirit", p. 430.

How, when it is truly a Triad, is the Triad described as one? Or why, when the One is in us, is the Triad said to be in us?... [Indeed] who can declare the holy Triad itself? Nevertheless, we can meet this difficulty, primarily by faith and then by using the illustrations mentioned above, I mean the image and the radiance, fountain and river, essence and expression. As the Son is in the Spirit as in his own image, so also the Father is in the Son.

Athanasius does not mention the third element (“draught”) of this newly-expanded illustration, though it is certainly prominent in the answer Athanasius gives to the second question, “why, when the One is in us, is the Triad said to be in us?” However, Athanasius does not elaborate on how this third element of the fountain-river-draught illustration would figure in an answer to the first question: “How, when it is truly a Triad, is the Triad described as one?” An answer to this question would have to take into consideration two facts. First, the use of different terms within the illustration indicates that there is a definite distinction within the one being of the Godhead: “the fountain is not *per se* the river or what is drunk,... nor the river *per se* the fountain, etc.”¹⁰⁵ Second, there is a single being shared by the three elements of the illustration: there is a “common stuff”, water, of which all three are composed.¹⁰⁶

As noted above, Athanasius’ rhetorical questions at the beginning of *ep. Serap.* 1.20 actually contain the presuppositions upon which the preceding discussion of the Biblical illustrations, including that of the fountain-river-draught, has been constructed.¹⁰⁷ Though the indivisible unity of the Trinity is always in the background of this exegesis, Athanasius does not explicitly relate the Spirit to the Father.¹⁰⁸ Athanasius is confident that his opponents accept the unity of the being of the Father and the Son, and therefore the unity of their activity.¹⁰⁹ He therefore simply defends, with the aid of the illustration of the fountain-river-draught, the unity of the activity of the Son and the Spirit, which logically implies the unity of their being.¹¹⁰ If these latter points are granted, the unity of the Spirit with the Father automatically follows.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁵ Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, p. 430.

¹⁰⁶ Stead, *Divine Substance*, pp. 263-264. See also p. 73, n.92.

¹⁰⁷ See p. 73.

¹⁰⁸ Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 418-419. See also Shapland, *Letters*, p.40.

¹⁰⁹ On the christology of the Tropici, see Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 23-25; Ritter, “Literarische Berichte”, p. 400, n.8.

¹¹⁰ McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, p. 357: “the unity of the *ousia* (that is, of the Divine Essence) is the highest premise of Athanasius’ thought, and the argument is from unity of *energeia* to identity of *ousia*... The progression is unity of *ousia*—unity of *energeia*—identity of *ousia*.” For another view, see Torrance, “Athanasius”, pp. 236-237.

¹¹¹ See Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, p. 419.

5. *The Uncreated Spirit*

The consideration of the Scriptural illustrations has as its main objective the demonstration of the united activity of the Son and the Spirit, and, by implication, the oneness in being of the Spirit and the Son. *Ep. Serap.* 1.21 initiates another examination:¹¹²

Finally let us look, one by one, at the references to the Holy Spirit in the divine Scriptures, and like good bankers,¹¹³ let us judge whether he has anything in common with the creatures or whether he pertains to God; that we may call him either a creature, or else other than the creatures, pertaining to and one with the Godhead which is in the unoriginated Triad.

This comparison of the Spirit and the creatures is based on a concept fundamental to Athanasius' thought: there is an absolute and qualitative distinction between God the Creator and his creatures.¹¹⁴ J.B. Walker points out that this is not an *a priori* concept for Athanasius. Rather, it stems from Athanasius' own concrete knowledge of God. Face to face with God, man learns that he is a creature, and will remain so, even in his union with God.¹¹⁵

The major task of *Ar.* 1-3 was the twin demonstration of: 1) the necessity of the eternal generation of the Son in the inner life of the Trinity; and 2) the contingency of the created realm. The obvious result of such a demonstration was the establishment of a qualitative distinction between the divine and the creaturely.¹¹⁶ Similarly, the contrast drawn between the Holy Spirit and the creatures by means of a concordance of Scriptural texts in *ep. Serap.* 1-4.7 is shaped by the belief that the Spirit is necessary to the divine life of the Trinity, and so he cannot be a creature. As such the Spirit has a different nature than the creatures (1 Cor 2:11-12), different attributes (1 Cor 12:11, 13) and different activities (1 Cor 6:11, 2 Cor 2:15, 1 Cor 3:16-17).

¹¹² PG 26.581A. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 120.

¹¹³ For an examination of other references to this *agraphon*, see Alfred Resch, *Agrapha. Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), pp. 112-128.

¹¹⁴ Louis Bouyer, *L'Incarnation et l'église-corps du Christ dans la théologie de saint Athanase* (Unam sanctam, no. 11; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1943), pp. 63-66; Walker, "Convenance épistémologique", *passim*.

¹¹⁵ "Convenance épistémologique", p. 268. Cf. Ritschl, *Athanasius*, p. 50.

¹¹⁶ Florovsky, "Concept of Creation", pp. 53-55. Yet, as Torrance ("Athanasius", pp. 221-222) notes, "this did not imply for Athanasius a lapse back into the old cosmological dualism between God and the world, for God is held to be unceasingly and creatively present in the universe, maintaining it in existence by grace, granting it its created order and function, and thus continuously interacting with what he has made."

Although Athanasius never directly calls the Holy Spirit “Creator”,¹¹⁷ his contrast of the Spirit and the creatures can point only in this direction. If the Spirit is uncreated, he has to be the Creator.¹¹⁸ The import of Athanasius’ argument at this point is well expressed by Panachiotis Christou:¹¹⁹

To say that the Spirit is uncreated is to say everything about it, because anything that is uncreated is essentially God. On the other hand, when something is named God, it is not necessarily uncreated, because the word god is also used to describe the possession of divinity by participation, and in other cases as well. Consequently it is a more exalted description to call the Spirit uncreated than to call him god.

a. *The Nature of the Spirit*

Athanasius initiates the contrast between the Holy Spirit and creatures with a consideration of their respective natures. Creatures come from nothing, and so there must have been a point in time when they came into being. As evidence for this, Athanasius cites Gen 1:1.¹²⁰ By contrast, according to 1 Cor 2:11-12, the Holy Spirit is said to be from God:¹²¹

For no one, it says, ‘knows the thoughts of a man except the spirit of the man which is in him. Even so, the thoughts of God no one knows except the Spirit of God. But we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God’ [1 Cor 2:11-12]. What kinship could there be, judging by the above, between the Spirit and the creatures? For the creatures were not; but God is being (ὢν ἔστιν) and the Spirit is from him (ἐξ οὗ). That which is from God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) could not be from that which is not (ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος), nor could it be a creature; lest, by their judgment, he also from whom (ἐξ οὗ) the Spirit is should be considered a creature. For they say also in their hearts that ‘there is no God’ [Ps 14:1]. For if, as no one knows the thoughts of a man save the spirit within him, so no one knows the thoughts of God save the Spirit who is in him (ἐν αὐτῷ): would it not be evil speech to call the Spirit who is in God (ἐν τῷ θεῷ) a creature, him who searches even the depths of God? For from

¹¹⁷ Lebon, *Letters*, p. 63, n.2. Lebon argues that the reason for this reticence was the fact that the Scriptures never explicitly call the Spirit “Creator”, and Athanasius did not wish to expose himself to the charge of being unscriptural. See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 140-141. The most explicit declaration of the Spirit’s Godhead comes in *ep. Serap.* 1.31 (PG 26.601A) where Athanasius says that the Spirit is “confessed as God” (θεολογούμενον). However, Athanasius never applies the term ‘God’ to the Spirit. For explanations of this fact, see Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 142-143, n.2; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 140-141; Panachiotis Christou, “Uncreated and created, unbegotten and begotten in the theology of Athanasius of Alexandria”, *Aug.* XIII (1973), 408.

¹¹⁸ Cf. *ep. Serap.* 3.4-5 (PG 26.632A-C).

¹¹⁹ “Uncreated and created”, p. 408.

¹²⁰ *Ep. Serap.* 1.22 (PG 26.581A). Cf. *ep. Serap.* 2.4 (PG 26.613A-B). See also Florovsky, “Concept of Creation”, pp. 50-51.

¹²¹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.22 (PG 26.581A-C). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p.121, revised.

this the speaker will learn to say that the spirit of man is outside the man himself, and that the Word of God, who is in the Father (ἐν τῷ πατρὶ), is a creature.

Athanasius devotes the first half of this passage from *ep. Serap.* 1.22 to a discussion of the phrase “from God” (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) from 1 Cor 2:12. This phrase, which is taken to indicate the nature of the Spirit, is contrasted with “from nothing” (ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος), which describes the nature of creatures. Athanasius’ intention here is to point to the gulf that lies between the Holy Spirit and creatures. The view that Athanasius’ exegesis of 1 Cor 2:12 in this passage is a statement about the mode of the Spirit’s origin thus entirely misses the thrust of Athanasius’ thought. Athanasius stresses the fact that God is being (ὁ ὢν) in contrast to nonbeing (τὸ μὴ ὄν):¹²²

God is being (ὢν ἐστίν), and the Spirit is from him (ἐξ οὗ).

The assertion that the Spirit is from God, who is uncreated being, can mean only that the Spirit’s nature is uncreated, as God’s nature is uncreated.¹²³ This interpretation is confirmed by Athanasius’ use of the same Pauline text in *ep. Serap.* 3.2:¹²⁴

The creatures come from nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων) and their existence has a beginning; for ‘In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth’ [Gen 1:1], and what is in them. The Holy Spirit is, and is said to be, from God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) (so said the Apostle). But if the Son cannot be a creature because he does not come from nothing but from God (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων οὐκ ἐστίν ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), then of necessity the Spirit is not a creature, for we have confessed that he comes from God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ). It is creatures that come from nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων).

Here, the phrase “from God” is applied not only to the Spirit, but also to the Son.¹²⁵ This phrase refers to the nature of the Son and the Spirit: they are both uncreated.¹²⁶

The second half of the passage from *ep. Serap.* 1.22 is a short explication centered around the “in him” (ἐν αὐτῷ) of 1 Cor 2:11. Athanasius first establishes that the use of the word “spirit” (πνεῦμα) in this passage implies a relationship of oneness in being. If the Spirit is a creature, as the Tropici assert, then he cannot be in (ἐν) God in the sense that he is one in being with God. As a creature he would be outside

¹²² *Ep. Serap.* 1.22 (PG 26.581B).

¹²³ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 71, 148.

¹²⁴ PG 26.628B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 171.

¹²⁵ Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.25 (PG 26.588C-589A).

¹²⁶ On the uncreated nature of the Son, see *ep. Serap.* 2.2-3 (PG 26.609B-612B); 2.4-5 (PG 26.613A-616C).

(ἐξῶθεν)¹²⁷ God. However, this reasoning makes no sense at all when seen in light of the human analogy of 1 Cor 2:11: to assert that the spirit of a man is outside (ἐξῶθεν) him is foolish. Further, when Scripture (e.g. Jn 14:10) says that the Son is in the Father (ἐν τῷ πατρὶ) this is understood to mean that he is one in being with the Father,¹²⁸ and so possesses an uncreated nature. To understand the preposition “in” (ἐν) in any other manner is to call the Son a creature.

The human analogy and the parallel case of the Son establish that the use of the preposition “in” from 1 Cor 2:11 can be understood only as an affirmation of the uncreated nature of the Spirit. This interpretation reinforces the conclusion of Athanasius’ exegesis of 1 Cor 2:12, that the Spirit is not a creature because he is from God, who is uncreated being.

The context which precedes the passage cited above from *ep. Serap.* 3.2 sheds further light on Athanasius’ understanding of 1 Cor 2:11-12 in the first two letters to Serapion. The bishop writes as follows:¹²⁹

What is remarkable, as the Son said, ‘What is mine belongs to the Father’ [cf. Jn 17:10], so the Holy Spirit, which is said to belong to the Son, belongs to the Father...[as] Paul writes: ‘No one knows the thoughts of a man except the spirit of the man which is in him. Even so the thoughts of God no one knows except the Spirit of God which is in him.’¹³⁰ But we received not the spirit of the world but the Spirit which is from God, that we might see the things that are freely given to us by God’ [1 Cor 2:11-12]. And throughout divine Scripture you will find that the Holy Spirit, who is said to belong to the Son, is also said to belong to God. This I wrote in my previous letter. If therefore the Son, because of his proper relationship (ιδιότητα) with the Father and because he is the proper offspring of his being, is not a creature, but is one in being (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father: the Holy Spirit likewise, because of his proper relationship (ιδιότητα) with the Son, through whom he is given to all men and whose is all that he has, cannot be a creature, and it is impious to call him so. These considerations are sufficient to dissuade anyone, be he ever so contentious, from continuing to call the Spirit of God a creature, who is in God (τὸ ἐν τῷ θεῷ) and searches the depths of God and who is given from the Father through the Son (ἐκ πατρὸς δι’ υἱοῦ διδόμενον) lest from this he shall be forced to call the Son also a creature, who is Word, Wisdom, Image, and Radiance, seeing whom we see the Father; and lest finally he should hear the words: ‘Whosoever denies the Son has not the Father’ [1 Jn 2:23].

¹²⁷ Athanasius used this term in his earlier writings to express a non-divine origin, and hence, a difference of nature. See Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 71.

¹²⁸ *Ep. Serap.* 2.9 (PG 26.624B): “By saying ‘I and the Father are one’ [Jn 10:30], and ‘He that has seen me has seen the Father’ [Jn 14:9] and, ‘I am in the Father and the Father in me’ [Jn 14:10], he signifies his eternity and that he is one in being with the Father” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 168-169, revised). See also *ep. Serap.* 2.4 (PG 26.613C-616A). For further instances, see Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 148, n.7.

¹²⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 3.1-2 (PG 26.625C-628A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 170-171, revised.

¹³⁰ The phrase “which is in him” does not occur in the text of 1 Cor 2:11. Athanasius’ exegesis of 1 Cor 2:11 in *ep. Serap.* 1.22 clearly lies behind this textual emendation. The same emendation occurs in Athanasius’ citation of the text in *ep. Serap.* 1.26. See p. 82.

The Son, because of his sharing attributes (ἰδιότης) with the Father, is one in being with him, and thus not a creature. Athanasius believes that the Pneumatomachi accept this.¹³¹ Yet, Athanasius continues, the confession that the Son is one in being with the Father entails the confession of the Spirit as one in being with the Father. The Spirit's sharing of attributes (ἰδιότης) with the Son means that, through the Son, the Spirit shares attributes with the Father and is thus, by inference, one in being with him.¹³² What role does 1 Cor 2:11-12 play in this argument? It provides no support whatsoever for Athanasius' contention that the Spirit shares attributes with the Son. He himself states that this has been shown in the first letter. But the text does supply Athanasius with direct confirmation that the Spirit shares attributes with the Father.

First, the Spirit is in (ἐν) God, and can therefore search the depths of God (1 Cor 2:10). But God is known by God alone.¹³³ Second, the gift of the Spirit from (ἐκ) the Father enables men to see the Son and through him, the Father.¹³⁴ Here, the phrase "the Spirit which is from God" (1 Cor 2:12) is interpreted in an economic sense and does not refer to the uncreated nature of the Spirit (as it did in *ep. Serap.* 1.22 and 3.2). It follows that the Spirit must be divine, since God is known by God alone and only one who is divine could reveal the Father.¹³⁵ The prepositions "in" and "from" from 1 Cor 2:11-12 thus ensure for Athanasius the oneness in being of the Spirit with the Father and the Son.¹³⁶

1 Cor 2:11 is again used when Athanasius turns to a discussion of the attributes of the Spirit in *ep. Serap.* 1.26. In this instance, though, the immediate purpose for its citation is to make plain the unchangeable nature of the Spirit. The end result, however, is the same as the use of this text in *ep. Serap.* 1.22 and 3.2: the demonstration of the Spirit's uncreated nature.

¹³¹ On the christological position of the Tropici, see p. 76, n.109.

¹³² Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.25 (PG 26.588C-589A): "If the Son, because he is of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς), is proper to his being (ἴδιος τῆς οὐσίας ἔστιν), it must be that the Spirit, who is said to be from God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), is in being proper (ἴδιον εἶναι κατ' οὐσίαν) to the Son" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 128, revised.) See also Campbell, "Holy Spirit", pp. 417-419.

¹³³ Walker, "Convenance épistémologique", *passim*. Walker points out that Athanasius' use of the term ὁμοούσιος safeguards the distinction between Creator and creature, and so ensures that any knowledge of God must come from God himself.

¹³⁴ The τὰ χαρισθέντα of 1 Cor 2:12 is understood as knowledge of the Father and the Son. Cf. *ep. Aeg. Lib.* 1 (PG 25.540A), where among the gifts of grace (χαρίσματα) given to men are "the knowledge of the Father and of the Word himself". Cf. also *ep. Serap.* 1.32 (PG 26.605B-C); 3.3 (PG 26.629A): "As he who has seen the Son sees the Father, so he who has the Holy Spirit has the Son" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 172).

¹³⁵ Walker, "Convenance épistémologique", *passim*.

¹³⁶ See Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 148; Torrance, "Spiritus Creator", pp. 214-215.

That the Spirit is above the creation, distinct in nature from things originated, and proper to the Godhead, can be seen from the following considerations also. The Holy Spirit is incapable of change and alteration. For...if no one 'knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God which is in him' [1 Cor 2:11], and as James said, in God 'there is no variation nor shadow that is cast by turning' [Jas 1:17] the Holy Spirit, being in God (ἐν τῷ θεῷ), must be incapable of change, variation, and corruption. But the nature of things originated and of things created is capable of change, inasmuch as it is outside the being of God (ἐξωθεν. . . τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίας), and came into existence from that which it is not (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων).¹³⁷

The unchangeability of God is a common motif in Athanasius' writings;¹³⁸ here it is stated by means of Jas 1:17. Yet, if the Spirit is in God, as 1 Cor 2:11 asserts and Athanasius has shown in *ep. Serap.* 1.22, then he too must be unchangeable. For to be in God is to be within his unchangeable being. The creatures, on the other hand, because they come from nothing are outside the being of God, and so mutable.¹³⁹ As proof of this last point, a number of Scriptures are given,¹⁴⁰ all of which refer to the moral mutability of the created realm. So Athanasius concludes:¹⁴¹

It will be clear that he [i.e. the Spirit] is not a creature, nor does he belong in being to the angels, for they are changeable, but he is the image of the Word and pertains to the Father.

In *ep. Serap.* 1.22, 25, 26 and 3.1-2 Athanasius employs 1 Cor 2:11-12 to establish two points: 1) the nature of the Spirit is uncreated; and as a logical deduction from this, 2) the Spirit is one in being with the Father and the Son. The Tropicists, who understood generation as the sole basis for the unity of being in the Godhead,¹⁴² clearly had problems with this exegesis. If the Son and the Spirit are in (ἐν) and from (ἐκ) God, then surely, they argued, this is simply confirmation that the orthodox doctrine of the Spirit constitutes the Spirit as a second "Son".¹⁴³ Athanasius

¹³⁷ PG 26.589C-592A. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 129,130, revised.

¹³⁸ E.g. *ep. Afr.* 7 (PG 26.1041B-C): "That which is changeable can not be like God, who is unchangeable." For other references, see Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 77, n.126; 144-145. Meijering [*Orthodoxy*, p. 101] writes: "Looking at the way in which Athanasius interprets various Biblical texts it becomes clear to us that he wants to show that all those texts which speak of an activity and change in the divine Person, do not contradict his ontological conception of God which implies that God is the unchangeable Being".

¹³⁹ See Florovsky, "Concept of Creation", p. 52.

¹⁴⁰ Among these texts is 1 Cor 6:3 (PG 26.592B). This text is cited to show that even the angels are capable of change; the Spirit therefore cannot be an angel as the Tropicists contend. See Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 77.

¹⁴¹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.26 (PG 26.592B). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 131, revised. See also Alkuin Heising, "Der Der Heilige Geist und die Heiligung der Engel in der Pneumatologie des Basilus von Cäsarea," *ZKT*, LXXXVII (1965), 271.

¹⁴² Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 148-149.

¹⁴³ See *ep. Serap.* 1.25 (PG 26.588C); 4.1 (PG 26.637B-C); 4.4-7 (PG 26.641C-648B).

has three ways of answering this charge. First, he insists on the ultimate ineffability of the Spirit.¹⁴⁴ Second, he argues that the very difference in the terms “Son” and “Holy Spirit” points to a real distinction between the two, though this can never be fully expressed in human language.¹⁴⁵ “Son” and “Holy Spirit” are not interchangeable, since the difference indicated by these two terms is eternally stable.¹⁴⁶ Finally, Athanasius draws up a rough sketch in *ep. Serap.* 1.20 of his own conception of the Spirit’s mode of existence:¹⁴⁷

Because the Son, the living Word, is one, his living activity and gift [the Spirit], whereby he sanctifies and enlightens, must be one, perfect and complete. [And] this Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, since it is from the Word, who is [himself] confessed to be from the Father, that he shines forth, and is sent, and is given.

However, Athanasius realizes that any answer to the Pneumatomachian question will remain intellectually unsatisfying unless there has been a prior commitment of believing worship of the God who reveals himself as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.¹⁴⁸ The exegesis of 1 Cor 2:11-12, for Athanasius, ensures that the Spirit has an uncreated nature, and so has a right to be worshipped alongside the Father and the Son, with whom he is one in being.

b. *The Uniqueness of the Spirit*

1 Cor 12:13, as noted above, was used to include the Holy Spirit as a third element (“draught”) in the illustration of fountain-river. This illustration had been successfully employed by Athanasius in the Arian controversy. Yet, for it to be of use in the fight against the Pneumatomachi of Thmuis,

¹⁴⁴ *Ep. Serap.* 4.4 (PG 26.641D-644A). Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.17 (PG 26.572B-C): “All created beings, and especially we who are men, find it impossible to speak adequately concerning the things that are ineffable” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 106). See also Torrance, “*Spiritus Creator*”, pp. 216-217.

¹⁴⁵ Shapland, *Letters*, p. 184, n.8.

¹⁴⁶ *Ep. Serap.* 4.4 (PG 26.644A). Cf. *ep. Serap.* 4.3 (PG 26.641B); 4.6 (PG 26.645C-D, 648A): “Hence in the Godhead alone the Father is and was and always is, because he is Father in the strict sense (κυρίως), and Only Father. The Son is Son in the strict sense (κυρίως) and Only Son. And of them it holds good that the Father is and is called always Father, and the Son, Son; and the Holy Spirit is always Holy Spirit... Thus the holy Triad remains incapable of alteration, and is known in one Godhead” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 188). See also Louth, “Reason and Revelation”, pp. 393-394; Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 431-432.

¹⁴⁷ PG 26.580A. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 116-117, revised. For a discussion of this text, see Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 116-117, nn. 15-17; Rodzianko, “Filioque”, pp. 299-302; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 152-155; Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 434-438.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.33 (PG 26.608A-B). See also Louth, “Reason and Revelation”, p. 395.

Athanasius had to extend it so as to encompass the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor 12:13 was central to this endeavour.¹⁴⁹

In Athanasius' second letter to Serapion, this same verse is interpreted somewhat differently. The bishop is arguing from the fact that as the Son is unique, so the Spirit must be also unique, and therefore distinct from the creatures who are many. He writes:¹⁵⁰

If the Son is the Word of God, he is one as the Father is one; for 'There is one God of whom are all things...and one Lord Jesus Christ' [1 Cor 8:6]. Hence both in our speech and in the Scriptures he is called 'only begotten Son'. But creatures are many and diverse: angels, archangels, cherubim, principalities, powers, and the rest, as we have said. But if the Son is not a creature because he does not belong to the many, but is one as the Father is one: then the Spirit likewise—for we must take our knowledge of the Spirit from the Son—cannot be a creature. For he does not belong to the many but is himself one. This the Apostle knows when he says: 'All these the one and the same Spirit works, dividing to each one severally, even as he wills' [1 Cor 12:11]; and a little farther on: 'In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body...and were all made to drink of one Spirit' [1 Cor 12:13].

This passage reveals Athanasius' insight that the Spirit cannot be divorced from Christ.¹⁵¹ Thus, all of the characteristics (τὰ ἴδια) of the Son are at once the characteristics of the Spirit (except, of course, the name "Son" and the Son's mode of origin).¹⁵² Among the divine characteristics of the Son is his oneness.¹⁵³ This is established and confirmed by 1 Cor 8:6.¹⁵⁴ For the Spirit to be truly the Spirit of the Son, he must be one as the Son is one.

This epistemological principle of acquiring knowledge of the Spirit from the Son is based upon the belief that correct knowledge of God must begin with Jesus Christ.¹⁵⁵ However, since this knowledge is appropri-

¹⁴⁹ See pp. 73-75.

¹⁵⁰ *Ep. Serap.* 3.3-4 (PG 26.629B-C). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 172-173, revised.

¹⁵¹ Ritschl, *Athanasius*, pp. 53-54.

¹⁵² *Ep. Serap.* 3.1 (PG 26.625A-B). See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 139-140.

¹⁵³ See, e.g., *Ar.* 3.16 (PG 26.353B-357A). See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 143.

¹⁵⁴ 1 Cor 8:6 is central to Athanasius' argument that the Father creates and effects all things through the Word. For if the Father creates all things through the Son, so that the Son and the Father are united in the act of creation, then the Son is not a creature, but the Creator like the Father (see Pollard, *Johannine Christology*, p. 199). As Athanasius writes in *Ar.* 1.19 (PG 26.52B-C): "Solomon says, 'God established the earth with wisdom, and by understanding prepared the heavens' [Prov 3:19]. Wisdom itself is the Word, and 'through him', as John says, 'all things came into being, and apart from him nothing came into being' [Jn 1:3]. And he is the Christ. 'For there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we for him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him' [1 Cor 8:6]. But if all things are through him, he himself cannot be numbered among 'the all things'."

However, Shapland (*Letters*, p. 36) wrongly sees this verse and 1 Cor 12:3 as the basis of Athanasius' key formula for expressing the unity of the divine activity (ἐνέργεια): "all things come from the Father through the Son in the Spirit". On the one hand, 1 Cor 12:3 is

ated only through the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ,¹⁵⁶ theology is only possible within an epistemological circle: the Spirit and the Father are known only with reference to Christ, but the knowledge of Christ can be received only in the Spirit. It is on the basis of these fundamental epistemological concepts that a principle which Laminski terms “the correlation principle” (Korrelationsprinzip) can be known.¹⁵⁷ This is an ontological principle which states that “the Spirit is to the Son as the Son is to the Father”. Laminski distinguishes various uses of this principle;¹⁵⁸ the one which is particularly relevant to the understanding of the passage cited above is that which guarantees the unity of the being of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. The Spirit has the same relationship to the Son as the Son has to the Father. The Son, who is one, is proper¹⁵⁹ (ἴδιος) to the Father, who is also one. The Spirit is proper (ἴδιον) to the Son, and since the Son is one, the Spirit has to be one. Thus Athanasius states in *ep. Serap.* 1.27:¹⁶⁰

never cited by Athanasius in the letters to Serapion. On the other hand, 1 Cor 8:6 does not provide a sufficient foundation to show that the Spirit is active in all the activity of the Father and the Son. Instead, the basis for this important formula is to be found in Eph 4:6. See Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 80; Heising, “Der Heilige Geist”, p. 272. Cf. also Georg Kretschmar, “Der Der Heilige Geist in der Geschichte. Grundzüge frühchristlicher Pneumatologie” in Walter Kasper, ed., *Gegenwart des Geistes. Aspekte der Pneumatologie* (Quaestiones Disputatae, vol. 85; Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1979), pp. 125-126.

¹⁵⁵ *Ep. Serap.* 3.1 (PG 26.625A): “from our knowledge of the Son, we may be able to have true knowledge of the Spirit” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 170). See Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 128-129, and the references given there. See also Walker, “Convenance épistémologique”, pp. 264-270.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.32 (PG 26.605B-C): “those who mind the things that belong to truth judge all things, but are themselves judged of no man [cf. 1 Cor 2:15]. For they have within them the Lord who in the Spirit reveals to them himself, and through himself the Father” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 147).

¹⁵⁷ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 136-138.

¹⁵⁸ The principle serves well as an *ad hominem* argument against the Tropicists, who admit the divinity of the Son, but deny that of the Spirit (*Der Heilige Geist*, p. 136; see also Lebon, *Lettres*, pp. 56-57; McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, p. 369; Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, p. 414). In addition, three dogmatic purposes of this principle can be distinguished. First, it guarantees the unity of being and nature of the three Persons of the Godhead (*Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 136-137; see also Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, p. 417). Second, on the basis of the Spirit’s relationship to the Son, the Spirit, through the Son, is a full member of the Trinity and in unity with the Father (*Der Heilige Geist*, p. 137; see also Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 417-419). Third, this principle is the basis of redemption and revelation. It is only through the correlation of the Son and the Spirit that divine activity is possible, since the Spirit actualizes the activity of the Godhead (*Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 138, 130; see also McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 366-370; Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 420-421, 427). Moreover, it is only from a correct knowledge of the Son that a proper understanding of the Spirit may arise (*Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 128-130).

¹⁵⁹ Athanasius repeatedly uses the term ἴδιος in the letters to Serapion to describe the intimate, absolutely immediate, unique and necessary relationship that exists between the members of the Trinity (Lebon, *Lettres*, p. 67, nn. 2-3).

¹⁶⁰ PG 26.593B-C. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 133, revised. Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.11 (PG 26.557C-560A); 1.29 (PG 26.597A-B): “if, as you say, the Spirit were at once an angel and a creature and ranked with the Triad, then it would be necessary not for one, but for all the

It is obvious that the Spirit does not belong to the many nor is he an angel. But because he is one, and, still more, because he is proper to the Word who is one, he is proper to God, who is one, and one in being (ὁμοούσιον) with him.

This passage directs the reader to the ultimate ground for Athanasius' insistence on the Spirit's uniqueness: the Trinity as a whole is one God.¹⁶¹ As he writes in *Ar.* 3.15:¹⁶²

For there is one form of the Godhead, which is also in the Word. There is one God the Father, who exists by himself (ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ ὢν) inasmuch as he is above all, and who is made manifest in the Son, inasmuch as he pervades all things, and in the Spirit, inasmuch as in him he is active in all things through the Word (τὸ ἐν ἅπασι διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνεργεῖν). Thus we confess that God is one through the Trinity.

If the Spirit is not unique, but one of the many creatures, then an innumerable host would be ranked alongside the Father and the Son, and the Christian concept of God would be destroyed.¹⁶³

Since both 1 Cor 12:13 and 1 Cor 12:11 qualify the Spirit with the adjective "one", they serve as excellent proof-texts for Athanasius' attempt to distinguish the Holy Spirit from the creatures in *ep. Serap.* 3.3-4. Oneness, a characteristic of the Son and of the Godhead, is applicable to the Spirit, and so he has to be differentiated from the creatures, who are many.

c. *The Spirit of Sanctification*

The Holy Spirit is a member of the Godhead because he does what only

angels that have been created to be ranked with the Godhead, and for there to be no longer a Triad but an unnumbered multitude therein. So that the initiation therein, which, to repeat, appears to be yours, is divided this way and that; and, by reason of its variegation, is without guarantee" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 138); *ep. Serap.* 1.20 (PG 26.577C-580A): "there is one sanctification, which is derived from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. As the Son is an only-begotten offspring, so also the Spirit, being given and sent from the Son, is himself one and not many, nor one from among many, but only Spirit. Because the Son, the living Word, is one, his living activity and gift whereby he sanctifies and enlightens must be one, perfect and complete" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 116-117, revised). Thus, for Athanasius, the uniqueness of the Holy Spirit has important soteriological as well as trinitarian consequences. Cf. Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 144.

¹⁶¹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.17 (PG 26.569C): "the whole Triad is one God". Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus' report of Athanasius' doctrinal position, pp. 172-173.

¹⁶² PG 26.353B.

¹⁶³ Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.2 (PG 26.533A): "Why then do they say that the Holy Spirit is a creature, who has the same oneness with the Son as the Son with the Father? Why have they not understood that, just as by not dividing the Son from the Father they ensure that God is one, so by dividing the Spirit from the Word they no longer ensure that the Godhead in the Triad is one, for they tear it asunder...?" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 62-63). See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 57-58, 166.

God can do: he sanctifies creatures.¹⁶⁴ Athanasius expands this concept in *ep. Serap.* 1.22-23 where he declares:¹⁶⁵

The Spirit is, and is called, Spirit of holiness (ἁγιωσύνης) and renewal (ἀνακαινώσεως).¹⁶⁶ For Paul writes: ...‘But you were sanctified (ἡγιασθήτε), but you were justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God’ [1 Cor 6:11]... But the creatures are sanctified (ἡγιαζόμενα) and renewed (ἀνακαινίζόμενα). ‘You shall send forth your Spirit, and they shall be created (κτισθήσονται), and you shall renew (ἀνακαινείς) the face of the earth’ [Ps 104:30]...He, therefore, who is not sanctified (μὴ ἡγιαζόμενον) by another, nor a partaker of sanctification (μηδὲ μετέχον ἡγιασμοῦ),...in whom all the creatures are sanctified (ἡγιαζεται), how can he be one from among all things ...? For those who say this must say that the Son, through whom all things came to be, is one from among all things.

The realization that, for Athanasius, creation and renewal/sanctification are aspects of one work is crucial for understanding this text.¹⁶⁷ For instance, in Athanasius’ figurative interpretation of Am 4:13, the word κτίζων is understood as a synonym for ἀνακαινίζων.¹⁶⁸ As Shapland explains:¹⁶⁹

God cannot create without imparting to His creatures something of His own character; and the continuance of His works is only secured by His presence within them.

Thus, the demonstration that the Spirit is involved in the work of sanctification is at once proof that the Spirit is Creator.

For Athanasius, 1 Cor 6:11 is proof that the Spirit is the Spirit of holiness, in whom the creatures are said to be sanctified (so Ps 104:30). Since sanctification is intimately linked to the work of creation, then the Spirit must belong to the Godhead, for only God can create and sanctify.

¹⁶⁴ Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 412-413, 430.

¹⁶⁵ PG 26.581C, 584A, 584B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 122, 123 revised.

¹⁶⁶ The fact that Athanasius uses two different terms, ἁγιωσύνη and ἀνακαινώσις, does not mean he has two different events in mind; both terms refer to the same process (Shapland, *Letters*, p. 122, n. 9; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 72).

¹⁶⁷ Heising, “Der Heilige Geist”, p. 273; Roldanus, *Christ*, p. 232.

¹⁶⁸ *Ep. Serap.* 1.9 (PG 26.533A-C). See also Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 82-83, nn.13, 14; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 62, n. 55.

¹⁶⁹ *Letters*, p. 37. Cf. *gent.* 41 (p.114.16-27; PG 25.84A-B): “So seeing that all created nature according to its own definition is in a state of flux and dissolution, therefore to prevent this happening and the universe dissolving back into nothing, after making everything by his own eternal Word and bringing creation into existence, he did not abandon it to be carried away and suffer through its own nature, lest it run the risk of returning to nothing. But being good, he governs and establishes the whole world through his Word who is himself God, in order that creation, illuminated by the leadership, providence, and ordering of the Word, may be able to remain firm, since it shares in the Word who is truly from the Father and is aided by him to exist, and lest it suffer what would happen, I mean a relapse into non-existence, if it were not protected by the Word” (trans. Thomson, *Athanasius*, p. 115).

1 Cor 6:11 is also a testimony to the one activity of the Trinity. Athanasius comments in *ep. Serap.* 1.31:¹⁷⁰

There is nothing that is not originated and actuated (ἐνεργεῖται) through the Word in the Spirit... [For example] we were justified, as the Apostle says: 'in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God' [1 Cor 6:11]. For the Spirit is indivisible (ἀδιαιρέτον) from the Word.

This passage is part of a larger section designed to establish the operation of the Spirit in all the works of God. The citation of 1 Cor 6:11 in this particular text demonstrates the Spirit's presence in God's great work of grace: the justification of the sinner. Thus he concludes: "the Spirit is indivisible from the Word". The assertion by the Tropici that the Spirit is a creature therefore involves blasphemy against the Son, and consequently, against the Father.¹⁷¹

The view that creation and sanctification are aspects of one work provides a buttress for Athanasius' concept that the Spirit is active in all the works of the Father and the Son.¹⁷² The justification of the sinful (according to 1 Cor 6:11) serves as an example of this concept. Yet, the Spirit's activity cannot be confined to sanctification, since this is intimately related to creation; to be active in one is to be active in the other. Thus, if the Spirit is one with the Father and the Son in all their activity, then he cannot be a creature, but must be the Creator. Upon this basis, Athanasius can assert that the Spirit, when active in sanctification (as shown by the citation of 1 Cor 6:11 in *ep. Serap.* 1.22), does what only God can do.¹⁷³

d. *The Spirit as Unction*

Further evidence that the Spirit is not a creature lies in the fact that the Scriptures call him "unction" (χρίσμα).¹⁷⁴ Previously, in *Ar.* 1.47,

¹⁷⁰ PG 26.601A-B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 143.

¹⁷¹ Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.2 (PG 26.533B-C): "For those who 'resist the Spirit', as the great martyr Stephen said, deny also the Son. But those who deny the Son have not the Father" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p.65).

¹⁷² Cf. Roldanus, *Christ*, pp. 152, 153, 236.

¹⁷³ Athanasius thus argues at great length that the Spirit cannot be an angel, for the angels, being themselves creatures, are incapable of sanctifying other creatures. See *ep. Serap.* 1.10 (PG 26.557A). See also Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", p. 271.

¹⁷⁴ The noun χρίσμα is derived from χρίειν which means "to touch lightly the surface of the body", and so "to rub" or "to anoint" with oil or an unguent. χρίσμα is that with which the body is anointed: "oil", "unguent" [J. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology: Its Origins and Early Development* (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt N.V., 1962), p. 186]. The term χρίσμα was employed by a number of the Greek Fathers to denote the post-baptismal anointing of the baptizand [see G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London/New York/

Athanasius had discussed the role of the Spirit as unction. There this characterization of the Spirit is primarily used to explain the reason behind the sanctification of the Son, to which reference is made in Jn 17:18-19. Emphasis was placed on the fact that the Word is divine since he anoints with the Spirit.¹⁷⁵ In *ep. Serap.* 1.23, Athanasius turns his attention to the implications of this characterization for the Spirit. He writes:¹⁷⁶

The Spirit is called unction...For John writes: 'As for you, the unction which you received of him abides in you, and you do not need anyone to teach you, but his unction (τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα)—his Spirit—'teaches you concerning all things' [1 Jn 2:27]. In the prophet Isaiah it is written: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed (ἔχρισέ) me' [Is 61:1]... But the creatures are by him...anointed and instructed in all things. But if the Spirit is the unction...with which the word anoints... all things, what likeness or propriety could the unction...have to the things that are anointed...? Thus by this consideration also he could not belong to the 'all things'. ...the unction [could not be] from among the things that are anointed; it pertains to the Word who anoints... For the unction has the fragrance and odour of him who anoints (τὸ μὲν γὰρ χρίσμα τὴν εὐωδίαν καὶ πνοὴν τοῦ χρίοντος ἔχει); and those who are anointed say, when they receive thereof: 'We are the fragrance (εὐωδία) of Christ' [2 Cor 2:15].

1 Jn 2:27 contains no explicit reference to the Spirit, but Athanasius sees an implicit one in the phrase "his unction" (τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα).¹⁷⁷ The citation of Is 61:1 is intended to confirm this reference. But, continues Athanasius, this means that there must be a difference between the unction and that which is anointed. The unction belongs to the Word who anoints "all things", for it has his fragrance (εὐωδία) and breath (πνοή). Proof of this is the fact that those anointed with the Spirit are able to say, "We are the fragrance (εὐωδία) of Christ" (2 Cor 2:15).¹⁷⁸ The impor-

Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1951), pp. 215-222, 280-283; L.L. Mitchell, *Baptismal Anointing* (Alcuin Club Collections, no. 48; London: S.P.C.K., 1966), pp. 52-57; H.M. Riley, *Christian Initiation* (Studies in Christian Antiquity, no. 17; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974), pp. 349-412]. Although a number of these Fathers ascribe the gift of the Holy Spirit to this post-baptismal χρίσμα, for instance Serapion of Thmuis (see Lampe, *Seal*, pp. 216, 221; Mitchell, *Anointing*, pp. 55-56), Athanasius never does so explicitly (Lampe, *Seal*, p.197; cf. Mitchell, *Anointing*, p. 53). Instead, he seems to identify the χρίσμα with the gift of the Spirit at baptism [see *Ar.* 1.46-47 (PG 26.105B-112A)].

¹⁷⁵ PG 26.108C-109C. See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 44-45, 159; Pollard, *Johannine Christology*, pp. 221-222; Greer, *Captain*, pp. 90-92; George Dragas, "Holy Spirit and Tradition. The Writings of St. Athanasius", *Sob*, I (1979), 65, 67.

¹⁷⁶ PG 26.584C-585A. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 123-124, revised.

¹⁷⁷ See Roldanus, *Christ*, p. 240, n.3.

¹⁷⁸ Outside of the letters to Serapion, Athanasius' only other use of this text is in *ep. Amun* (PG 26.1169A): "Everything made by God is beautiful and pure; for the Word of God has made nothing useless or impure. For according to the Apostle, 'we are the fragrance of Christ among those who are being saved' [2 Cor 2:15]".

tance of this text for Athanasius' argument is best seen from two other passages.

The first of these passages makes use of 2 Cor 2:15 in a manner nearly identical to that of *ep. Serap.* 1.23. It reads:¹⁷⁹

...if the creatures are anointed...in him, the Spirit cannot be a creature. For that which anoints is not like to those which are anointed. Moreover, this unction is a breath of the Son (τὸ χρίσμα τοῦτο πνοὴ ἐστὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ), so that he who has the Spirit says: 'We are the fragrance (εὐωδία) of Christ' [2 Cor 2:15]... But if the Spirit is the fragrance (εὐωδία)...of the Son, it is clear that the Spirit cannot be a creature.

The second passage occurs in *ep. Serap.* 1.24 and connects the image of the unction to the theme of participation in God. This passage runs as follows:¹⁸⁰

...the fact of our being called partakers of Christ and partakers of God (μέτοχοι χριστοῦ καὶ μέτοχοι θεοῦ) shows that the unction...that is in us belongs, not to the nature of things originate, but to the nature of the Son who, through the Spirit who is in him, joins us to the Father.

A couple of ideas are discernible in the first passage. Εὐωδία and πνοή are apparently considered synonymous by Athanasius. Furthermore, it is those who have the Spirit, i.e. those who have been anointed with the fragrance (εὐωδία) /breath (πνοή) of the Son, who are able to say: "We are the fragrance of Christ". Finally, this latter statement shows that, because the Spirit is the fragrance (εὐωδία) of the Son, he cannot be a creature.¹⁸¹ The second passage indicates that the theme which underlies Athanasius' thought about the Spirit as unction is that of participation in God. Through the anointing of the Spirit men are enabled to partake of Christ.¹⁸² Thus, since the Spirit as unction is the fragrance (εὐωδία) of Christ, believers can say that they partake of, or, in the words of the Apostle Paul, "are the fragrance of Christ". Their participation in the fragrance of Christ makes them fragrant.¹⁸³

Athanasius' use of 2 Cor 2:15, in regard to the Spirit as unction, is directed by his belief that the one who effects participation in God, by anointing, must himself be divine.¹⁸⁴

¹⁷⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 3.3 (PG 26.628C-629A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p.172, revised.

¹⁸⁰ PG 26.585C. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 126.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Campbell, "Holy Spirit", p. 413.

¹⁸² Shapland (*Letters*, p. 40) writes: "the characteristic quality imparted by the Spirit is that of Christ".

¹⁸³ See also Roldanus, *Christ*, p. 244.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Louis Ligier, *La Confirmation* (Théologie Historique, vol. 23; Paris: Beauchesne, 1973), pp. 158-160.

e. *The Indwelling Spirit*

Following his discussion of the Spirit as unction in *ep. Serap.* 1.23, Athanasius develops further the concept that it is through the Holy Spirit that men participate in the divine nature. This point had been touched upon already in *Ar.* 3.24:¹⁸⁵

Without the Spirit we are strangers and far from God, but by the participation (μετοχή) of the Spirit we are joined (συναπτόμεθα) to the Godhead.

Athanasius now deepens this concept by an exposition of 1 Cor. 3:16-17 in *ep. Serap.* 1.24:¹⁸⁶

Further it is through the Spirit that we are all said to be partakers (μέτοχοι) of God. For it says: 'Do you not know that you are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? If any man destroys the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple are you' [1 Cor 3:16-17]. If the Holy Spirit were a creature, we should have no participation (μετουσία) of God in him. If indeed we are joined to a creature, we should be strangers to the divine nature inasmuch as we did not partake therein. But, as it is, the fact of our being called partakers of Christ and partakers of God shows us that the unction and seal that is in us belongs, not to the nature of things originate, but to the nature of the Son who, through the Spirit who is in him, joins us to the Father.

According to 1 Cor 3:16-17, it is through the Spirit that men participate in God. If the Spirit is a creature, then participation (μετουσία) in God would be impossible.¹⁸⁷ The thrust of Athanasius' argument receives its force from verse 16 of this citation. "You are a temple of God" is

¹⁸⁵ PG 26.373B-C. Cf. *decr.* 14.4 (p.12.24-26; PG 25.440C-D). See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 50; Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, p. 285.

¹⁸⁶ PG 26.585B-C. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 125-126, revised.

¹⁸⁷ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 74,165; D.L. Balas, *ΜΕΤΟΧΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ. Man's Participation in God's Perfections According to Saint Gregory of Nyssa*, (Studia Anselmiana, no. 55; Rome: Pontificium Institutum S. Anselmi/I.B.C.' Libreria Herder, 1966), p. 12. Cf. the similar argumentation in *Ar.* 1.16 (PG 26.45A) involving 1 Cor 3:16 and 2 Cor 6:16. Deification (θεοποίησις) is attributed to the Spirit in *decr.* 14.4 (p.12.24-26; PG 26.440C-D); *Ar.* 1.9 (PG 26.28D-29A). Cf. *Ar.* 3.33 (PG 26.396A). Harnack (*Dogmengeschichte*, II, 44-46, n.2; however, cf. *ibid.*, p. 162, n.1) argued that Athanasius' concept of θεοποίησις and μετουσία (see also p. 103 below) was metaphysical rather than ethical, that is to say, this concept primarily signified the elevation of human nature into divine incorruptibility. Shapland (*Letters*, pp. 37-39; 125-126, n.1) supports Harnack's opinion. Recently however, a number of scholars have criticized this one-sided approach and emphasized that Athanasius does show a definite concern for Christians to live a holy life under the guidance of the Spirit. See H.R. Smythe, "Reviews: *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*, translated with Introduction and Notes by C.R.B. Shapland", *JTS*, n.s., III (1952), 121; Ritschl, *Athanasius*, pp. 51-52; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 162-163, 168-169; Roldanus, *Christ*, pp. 186-195, 243-244; Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, p. 285, n.8. Cf. also Dietrich Ritschl, *Memory and Hope: An Inquiry Concerning the Presence of Christ* (New York: The Macmillan Co./ London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1967), pp. 94-96.

interpreted as meaning “partakers of God”, and also, because Christ is assumed to be one in being with the Father, “partakers of Christ”. How is this participation effected? Only through the Spirit of God who dwells in the believers. Since the Spirit joins men to the Father, he must be divine, for he does what only God can do.¹⁸⁸ As Athanasius concludes:¹⁸⁹

...we should be mad to say that the Spirit has a created nature and not the nature of God. For it is on this account that those in whom he is are made divine (θεοποιουῦνται). If he makes men divine (θεοποιεῖ) it is not to be doubted that his nature is of God.

A similar exposition of 1 Cor 3:16 appears in *ep. Serap.* 3.3 in a more abbreviated form. The relevant passage is as follows:¹⁹⁰

Moreover, as he who has seen the Son sees the Father, so he who has the Holy Spirit has the Son, and, having him, is a temple of God. For Paul writes, ‘Do you not know that you are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you?’ [1 Cor 3:16]. John says: ‘By this we know that we abide in God and he in us because he has given us of his Spirit’ [1 Jn 4:13]. But if we have confessed that the Son is not a creature, because he is in the Father and the Father in him, then the Spirit likewise cannot possibly be a creature; for the Son is in him and he is in the Son. Wherefore, he who receives the Spirit is called a temple of God.

This text, like the passage in *ep. Serap.* 1.24, follows a discussion of the Spirit as unction. However, while in *ep. Serap.* 1.24, it led into a discussion of the participation in God through the Spirit, here it is directed towards a different goal: the indwelling of God.¹⁹¹ Furthermore, the same text, 1 Cor 3:16, is used; but now, in *ep. Serap.* 3.3, the phrase “a temple of God” is examined in more detail.

The one who has the Spirit has the Son; and, as Athanasius has demonstrated in *ep. Serap.* 2.1-9, the one who has the Son has the Father. Thus, when one receives the Spirit, one also receives the Son and the Father, and so one becomes a temple of the triune God. Since the Spirit is so associated with the Father and the Son, he cannot be a creature.

¹⁸⁸ See Louis Bouyer, *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers*. Vol. 1 of *History of Christian Spirituality*, trans. M.P. Ryan (New York: The Seabury Press, 1963), pp. 418-419. Cf. the same conclusion with reference to the Son in *Ar.* 1.39 (PG 26.92C-93B); 2. 69-70 (PG 26.293A296C).

¹⁸⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.24 (PG 26.585C-588A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 126-127. Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.25 (PG 26.589B-C): “The [the Spirit] in whom creation is made divine cannot be outside the Godhead of the Father” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 129).

¹⁹⁰ PG 26.629A-B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 172, revised.

¹⁹¹ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 91.

6. *The Spirit in the Trinity*

When Athanasius has concluded his survey of the Scriptural witness to the Holy Spirit, he turns to an examination of the tradition, teaching and faith of the Church.¹⁹² According to Athanasius, the traditional teaching about the Trinity is as follows:¹⁹³

There is, then, a Triad, holy and complete, confessed to be God in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, having nothing foreign or external mixed with it; not composed of one that creates and one that is originated, but all creative; and it is consistent and in nature indivisible, and its activity is one. The Father does all things through the Word in the Holy Spirit. Thus the unity of the Holy Triad is preserved. ...It is a Triad not only in name and form of speech, but in truth and actuality. For as the Father is he that is, so also his Word is one that is and God over all. And the Holy Spirit is not without actual existence, but exists and has true being. Less than these [persons] the Catholic Church does not hold ... nor does she add to them by speculation...

This tradition, which was given by Christ, preached by the Apostles, and kept by the Fathers, is the foundation of the Church. In other words, the Church is grounded on the triune God.

Although tradition is not understood by Athanasius as a source of doctrine independent of Scripture,¹⁹⁴ his position with regard to the relationship of Scripture and tradition is definitely not one of *sola scriptura*. His actual stance is much more complex, as M.B. Handspicker shows in his paper "Athanasius on Tradition and Scripture".¹⁹⁵ Handspicker begins with an examination of Athanasius' understanding of the term "tradition".¹⁹⁶ The form of the tradition is that which is handed down faithfully by "eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word", that is, of Christ. The content of the tradition is the apostolic witness to the act of God in Jesus Christ. Scripture, by contrast, is that which has been written down.¹⁹⁷ A basic requirement for the proper exegesis of Scripture is a knowledge of its χαρακτήρ and σκοπός,¹⁹⁸ which are christological in

¹⁹² *Ep. Serap.* 1.28 (PG 26.593C-596A). These three terms are roughly synonymous for Athanasius. See Pollard, "Exegesis", pp. 420-421; Georges Florovsky, "The Function of Tradition in the Ancient Church" in his *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publ. Co., 1972), p. 83.

¹⁹³ *Ep. Serap.* 1.28 (PG 26.596A-B). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 134-135. For a discussion of this passage, see Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 134-135, nn.3-6; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 79-81.

¹⁹⁴ See Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 133-134, n.2; Pollard, "Exegesis", pp. 419-421; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 104-105.

¹⁹⁵ *ANQ*, n.s., III (1962), 13-29.

¹⁹⁶ "Tradition", pp. 14-18. The phrase "eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word" is a formula which Athanasius takes from Lk 1:2.

¹⁹⁷ "Tradition", p. 17.

¹⁹⁸ *Ὁ σκοπός*, see pp. 63-64, n. 41.

orientation.¹⁹⁹ The σκοπός of Scripture is thus identical with the content of the tradition: the witness to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. As such, neither Scripture nor tradition has priority for authoritative doctrine. Instead the locus of authority is to be found in the σκοπός of both Scripture and tradition: Christ, the Incarnate Word.²⁰⁰

Consequently, when Athanasius, in *ep. Serap.* 1.28, proceeds to look at the tradition upon which the Church is founded, he does not regard himself as turning to a source of doctrine in addition to Scripture. The examination of this tradition will confirm what has been found in the search of the Scriptures: the Spirit of the Son is inseparable from the Son, and, by inference, also inseparable from the Father.

The following sections discuss Athanasius' use of the Corinthian letters in this treatment of the Church's tradition: first, concerning the relationship of the Spirit to the Trinity (1 Cor 12:4-6; 2 Cor 3:13) and second, regarding the inspiration of the prophets and apostles (2 Cor 13:3). As he interprets these passages, Athanasius' thought is directed by a fundamental belief: the association of the Spirit in the activity of the Father and the Son means that there exists an essential unity between the three.²⁰¹

a. *The Indivisible Trinity*

From the Biblical illustration of fountain-river-draught, Athanasius established that the Spirit could not be separated from the Son.²⁰² In *ep. Serap.* 1.30 he produces an example to show that what is true of the unified activity of the Spirit and the Son is also true of the activity of the whole Trinity.²⁰³ Thus the bishop says to the Tropicci:²⁰⁴

...the blessed Paul does not divide the Triad as you do; but teaching its unity, when he wrote to the Corinthians concerning spiritual matters, he finds the source of all things in one God, the Father, saying: 'There are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are varieties of ministries, but the same Lord. And there are varieties of operations, but the same God who produces all in all' [1 Cor 12:4-6]. The gifts which the Spirit divides to each are bestowed from the Father through the Word (παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ λόγου). For all things that are of the Father are of the Son also; therefore those things which

¹⁹⁹ "Tradition", p. 21. See also *Ar.* 3.29 (*PG* 26.385A-388A).

²⁰⁰ "Tradition", pp. 25, 27-28. A corollary assertion is that neither Scripture nor tradition can be subsumed under the other. Both are evaluated on the basis of that to which they bear witness. Cf. Louth, "Reason and Revelation", p. 392.

²⁰¹ Cf. Campbell, "Holy Spirit", pp. 421-423.

²⁰² See pp. 71-76.

²⁰³ Shapland, *Letters*, p. 141, n.8.

²⁰⁴ *PG* 26.600A-C. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 141-142, revised.

are given from the Son in the Spirit are gifts of the Father. And when the Spirit is in us, the Word also, who gives the Spirit, is in us, and in the Word is the Father. So it is as it is said: 'We will come, I and the Father, and make our abode with him' [Jn 14:23]. For where the light is, there is also the radiance; and where the radiance is, there also is its activity and lambent grace.

This passage reveals Athanasius' belief that the Father is the source of the common activity of the Godhead.²⁰⁵ 1 Cor 12:4-6 is to be understood in this light. The activity described by 1 Cor 12:4-6, the spiritual gifts, stems from the Father and comes through the Son to be activated in the Spirit.²⁰⁶ But this activity is common to the members of the Trinity only because they all share the same divine being that flows from the Father.²⁰⁷ Athanasius is thus led to state the coinherence of the three persons in their unified activity.²⁰⁸ This coinherence and unity is further expressed by Jn 14:23 and by the illustration of light-radiance-lambent grace (i.e., illumination).

Then there follows an exposition of 2 Cor 13:13 which again shows the unity of the Trinity.

This again the Apostle teaches, when he wrote to the Corinthians, in the second letter as well, saying: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion (ἡ κοινωνία) of the Holy Spirit be with you all' [2 Cor 13:13]. For this grace and gift that is given is given in the Triad, from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. As the grace given is from the Father through the Son, so we can have no communion (ἡ κοινωνία) in the gift except in the Holy Spirit. For it is when we partake (μετέχοντες) of him that we have the love of the Father and the grace of the Son and the communion (τὴν κοινωνίαν) of the Spirit himself.

This consideration also shows that the activity of the Triad is one. The Apostle does not mean that the things which are given are given differently and separately by each person, but that what is given is given in the Triad, and that all are from one God.²⁰⁹

2 Cor 13:13 establishes two crucial points for Athanasius. First, every grace and gift²¹⁰ from the Father through the Son can only be actualized for believers in the Holy Spirit. Thus, only as they partake (μετέχοντες) of the Spirit, can they experience the love of the Father, the grace of the Son and the communion of the Spirit. This assertion secures the insepa-

²⁰⁵ McIntyre, "Holy Spirit", p. 356; Campbell, "Holy Spirit", pp. 422-423.

²⁰⁶ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 83, n.158.

²⁰⁷ Campbell, "Holy Spirit", p. 422.

²⁰⁸ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 83,110.

²⁰⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.30-31 (PG 26.600C-601A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 142.

²¹⁰ For a partial list of the gifts of grace, cf. *ep. Aeg. Lib.* 1 (PG 25.540A): "the pattern of a heavenly way of life, power against demons, adoption as a son and that supreme and special gift, the knowledge of the Father and of the Word himself, and the gift of the Holy Spirit." G. Gentz ["Athanasius", *RAC*, I (1950), 863] believes *ep. Aeg. Lib.* was an accompanying letter to the first or second of the letters to Serapion.

rability of the three persons, for apart from the Spirit there can be no experience of the Father or the Son.²¹¹ Second, this text is testimony to the one divine activity of the Trinity. The assignment of different manifestations to the three persons as sources should not be interpreted to mean that these gifts are given separately. Every gift has its source in one God, and every member of the Trinity takes part in the transmission of that gift to the believer.

The same texts are found again in conjunction in *ep. Serap.* 3.5-6:²¹²

The Spirit is not outside the Word, but, being in the Word, through him is in God. And so the spiritual gifts are given in the Triad. For, as he writes to the Corinthians, in their distribution there is the same Spirit and the same Lord and the same God, 'who produces all in all' [1 Cor 12:6]. For the Father himself through the Word in the Spirit works and gives all things. Assuredly, when he prayed for the Corinthians, he prayed in the Triad, saying: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all' [2 Cor 13:13]. For inasmuch as we partake of the Spirit, we have the grace of the Word and, in the Word, the love of the Father. And as the grace of the Triad is one, so also the Triad is indivisible.

Again the coinherence and unity of the Trinity guides the exegesis of 1 Cor 12:6.²¹³ The spiritual gifts of 1 Cor 12:4-6 are one particular example of the fact that the three persons of the Trinity coinhere in their activity. Here, in the exposition of 2 Cor 13:13, there is a slightly different emphasis from that in *ep. Serap.* 1.30-31. Athanasius states that there is "one grace of the Triad", which, for him, implies that the Trinity is indivisible.²¹⁴ This serves to heighten the assertion made in *ep. Serap.* 1.30, that to partake of one member of the Trinity is to partake of the other members as well.

Yet, as Roldanus observes, this strong emphasis on the unity of the divine being and activity in the exegesis of 2 Cor 13:13 could, if taken alone, obscure the distinctive place of the Spirit in redemption and sanctification.²¹⁵ But, from other texts it is clear that Athanasius assigns

²¹¹ Also behind this concept lies Athanasius' belief in the importance of the Spirit for the believer's participation in the divine nature. See pp. 91-92.

²¹² *PG* 26.633A-B. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 175, revised.

²¹³ Athanasius cites only the final phrase of 1 Cor 12:4-6 due to the fact that the Nicene community of Thmuis had requested an abridgement of *ep. Serap.* 1. See p. 62.

²¹⁴ Cf. *ep. Serap.* 1.14 (*PG* 26.565A-B): "the holy and blessed Trinity is indivisible and one in itself. When mention is made of the Father, there is included also his Word, and the Spirit who is in the Son. If the Son is named, the Father is in the Son, and the Spirit is not outside the Word. For there is from the Father one grace which is fulfilled through the Son in the Holy Spirit" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 93-94); *ep. Serap.* 1.20 (*PG* 26.577C): "there is one sanctification, which is derived from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 116); *ep. Serap.* 3.6 (*PG* 26.636A): "Paul taught the oneness of the grace given in the Triad" (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 176).

²¹⁵ *Christ*, pp. 237-238.

“a specialized role” to the Holy Spirit within the common activity of the Trinity: namely, the actualization of this activity.²¹⁶

The activity of God in his Church, as described by 1 Cor 12:4-6 and 2 Cor 13:13, is, for Athanasius, a demonstration of the inseparable unity of the Trinity. Without the Spirit, none of the divine activity could be experienced by the believer, for it is the Spirit who actualizes this activity. This means that the Spirit must coinhere in all the activity of the Father and the Son. Denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit thus entails an attitude which is tantamount to rejection of the work of the Father and the Son.²¹⁷ Furthermore, such a coinherence of the Spirit in all the activity of the Godhead is clear evidence that the Spirit is indivisible from the Father and the Son, and that he shares with them a common being.

b. *The Spirit of Prophecy*

Yet another proof for the unity of the Word and the Spirit is the traditional teaching about the inspiration of the prophets and apostles. Prior to his examination of the role of the Word and the Spirit in inspiration, Athanasius establishes that Jn 14:23 (“We will come, the Father and I”) implies that the believer is indwelt by the Trinity. It is a natural step to pass from this assertion to the contention that the Word indwells the prophets when they prophesy in the Holy Spirit.²¹⁸ A list of Scriptures is then cited in order to substantiate this statement.²¹⁹ Athanasius concludes:²²⁰

Thus when the Spirit is said to be in anyone, it means that the Word is in him, bestowing the Spirit. When the prophecy was being fulfilled, ‘I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh’ [Joel 2:28], Paul said: ‘According to the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ unto me’ [Phil 1:19].²²¹ And to the Corinthians he wrote, ‘Or do you seek a proof of Christ who speaks in me?’ [2 Cor 13:3]...But if he who spoke in him was Christ, then clearly the Spirit that spoke in him was Christ’s.

²¹⁶ Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, p. 427. See also McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 360-361.

²¹⁷ McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 360-361.

²¹⁸ *Ep. Serap.* 1.31 (PG 26.601B-C). Athanasius develops this thought in the following manner: “When Scripture says ‘The Word of the Lord came’ to this particular prophet, it shows that he prophesied in the Holy Spirit” [*ep. Serap.* 1.31 (PG 26.601B-C), trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 144]. Cf. *ep. Serap.* 4.3 (PG 26.641B-C)]. By “the Word of the Lord” Athanasius seems to understand the second Person of the Trinity, instead of the message from God (see Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 85).

²¹⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 1.31 (PG 26.601C-604A).

²²⁰ *Ep. Serap.* 1.31 (PG 26.604A-B). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p.145, revised.

²²¹ The phrase “unto me” is not present in the text of Phil 1:19.

Phil 1:19 indicates that Paul was among the recipients of the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit, the fulfillment of Joel 2:28. Thus, when Paul wrote his second letter to the Corinthians he was a man indwelt by the Spirit. Yet, in that letter he could write that Christ spoke in him (2 Cor 13:3). This assertion can mean only that Paul was inspired by both Christ and his Spirit. The dual presence of the Word and the Spirit in the activity of inspiration implies that the two share a common being: "the Spirit is indivisible from the Word".²²²

Ep. Serap. 3.5 reiterates the same texts and argument. However, this time 2 Cor 13:3 is given first, then Phil 1:19. Athanasius writes:²²³

So clearly is the Spirit indivisible from the Son that what is now to be said leaves no room for doubt. When the Word came upon the prophet, it was in the Spirit that the prophet used to speak the things he received from the Word. ...[Thus] when Christ spoke in Paul as Paul himself said, 'If you seek a proof of Christ who speaks in me' [2 Cor 13:3] it was, nonetheless, the Spirit that he had bestowing upon him the power of speech. For he writes: 'according to the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ unto me' [Phil 1:19]...[Thus] the Spirit is not outside the Word, but, being in the Word, through him is in God. And so the spiritual gifts are given in the Triad.

The coinherence of the Word and the Spirit in the inspiration of the Apostle Paul is decisive proof that the Holy Spirit cannot be separated from the Word. 2 Cor 13:3 and Phil 1:19 are adduced in support of this statement. 2 Cor 13:3 indicates that Christ spoke through the Apostle. But, Athanasius maintains, there is another text, Phil 1:19, which states it was the Spirit which had supplied Paul with the gift of prophetic speech. As inspiration is the work of both the Word and the Spirit, they can be regarded only as indivisible. In both of these texts, *ep. Serap.* 1.31 and 3.5, Athanasius' exposition of 2 Cor 13:3 and Phil 1:19 demonstrates the association of the Word and the Spirit in the inspiration of the Apostle Paul. This, in turn, leads to a statement about the coinherence of the Word and the Spirit, with the implication that they possess a common being.²²⁴ *Ep. Serap.* 3.5 however takes the argument further.

The fact that both the Word and the Spirit inspire the Apostle Paul shows not only that the Spirit is not outside of the Word, but also that, by being in the Word, the Spirit is in God. Athanasius has already stated that because the Son is in (ἐν) God, he cannot be a creature.²²⁵ If the

²²² *Ep. Serap.* 1.31 (PG 26.601B). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 143. See also Campbell, "Holy Spirit", pp. 416-417.

²²³ PG 26.632C, 633A. Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 174, 175, revised.

²²⁴ Cf. Campbell, "Holy Spirit", p. 423.

²²⁵ *Ep. Serap.* 3.4 (PG 26.629C-632A).

Tropici accept this statement, then they must also recognize that the Spirit is not a creature, for he is in (ἐν) the Son, and by deduction, therefore he is in (ἐν) God.²²⁶ At this point, Athanasius draws upon the conclusions he reached from his exposition of 1 Cor 2:11: the preposition “in” (ἐν) implies oneness in being.²²⁷ The consideration of 2 Cor 13:3 and Phil 1:19 in *ep. Serap.* 3.5 thus leads to an implicit statement of the oneness in being of the Spirit with the Father and Son.²²⁸ Upon this basis, Athanasius can proceed to affirm that Paul’s inspiration came from the whole Trinity: “the Father himself through the Word in the Spirit works and gives all things”.²²⁹

The exposition of 2 Cor 13:3 and Phil 1:19 in *ep. Serap.* 1.31 occurs subsequent to the exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6 and 2 Cor 13:13, and is, so to speak, an example of the Spirit’s presence in all the mighty works of God. By contrast, in *ep. Serap.* 3.5, the exposition of 2 Cor 13:3 and Phil

²²⁶ See Campbell, “Holy Spirit”, p. 417.

²²⁷ See pp. 78-82. See also Shapland, *Letters*, p. 42.

²²⁸ The concept of oneness in being is applied to the Spirit in only two passages in the letters to Serapion: in *ep. Serap.* 1.27 (PG 26.593B-C): “It is obvious that the Spirit does not belong to the many nor is he an angel. But because he is one, and, still more, because he is proper to the Word who is one, he is proper to God who is one, and one in being with him” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 133, revised); and indirectly in *ep. Serap.* 3.1 (PG 26.625A-B, 625C-628A): “We shall find that the Spirit has to the Son the same proper relationship as we have known the Son to have to the Father.... If therefore the Son, because of his proper relationship with the Father and because he is the proper offspring of his being, is not a creature, but is one in being with the Father: the Holy Spirit likewise, because of his proper relationship with the Son, through whom he is given to all men and whose is all that he has, cannot be a creature, and it is impious to call him so” (trans. Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 170, 171, revised). The phrase “oneness in being” (ὁμοούσιος) occurs around 150 times in Athanasius’ genuine works. However, less than half of these instances shed light on his understanding of the concept, for the majority of them are simply reports about the thoughts of other Christian authors (Stead, *Divine Substance*, p. 260; pace Kannengiesser, “Traditional Christology”, p. 111: “the great defender of Nicaea uses... *homoousios* only once or twice in his writings”). Only in *ep. Serap.* 1.27 does Athanasius explicitly refer to the Spirit as one in being with the Father (see Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 142; cf. McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, p. 360).

Athanasius’ definite reluctance to use the term with regard to the Spirit stems from two reasons: 1) his desire to use Biblical terms (Kannengiesser, “Traditional Christology”, p. 111; cf. also above p. 78, n. 117); 2) lack of precedent for its application to the Holy Spirit (Shapland, *Letters*, p. 133, n. 7). Notwithstanding, Athanasius’ aim in *ep. Serap.* 1-4.1-7 was to demonstrate the implicit oneness in being of the Spirit with the Son, and through the Son, with the Father. For his intense reflection upon the nature of God and his work as Creator and Saviour, coupled with an attentive study of the Scriptures, led Athanasius to believe that the Holy Spirit was indeed one in being with the Father and the Son (see Walker, “Convenance épistémologique”, p. 257). For recent studies on Athanasius’ use and understanding of the concept of oneness in being, see G.C. Stead, “‘Homoousios’ dans la pensée de saint Athanase” in Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie*, pp. 231-253; *idem*, *Divine Substance*, pp. 260-266; Walker, “Convenance épistémologique”, *passim*; Christou, “Uncreated and created”, p. 399.

²²⁹ *Ep. Serap.* 3.5 (PG 26.633B).

1:19 serves as an introduction to, rather than an illustration of, the exposition of 1 Cor 12:4-6 and 2 Cor 13:3.²³⁰ But this difference is simply stylistic; the interpretation remains the same. The inspiration of the Apostle Paul, as 2 Cor 13:3 and Phil 1:19 attest, is an example of a universal truth: because the Spirit is present in all the activity of the Father and the Son, he must share a common being with them.

7. Summary

At the very beginning of the first of his letters to Serapion, Athanasius sets forth his position with regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In essence, his position rests on two concepts, which, for the purpose of distinction, can be termed “christological” and “trinitarian”. The first states that the Spirit has a relationship of unity with the Son, which is analogous to, but not identical with, that of the Son to the Father. The second maintains that the Trinity is an indivisible unity, a unity which moreover guarantees the efficacy of Christian salvation and sanctification.²³¹ Although it is these two concepts which primarily inform Athanasius’ exegesis of the Corinthian correspondence in these letters, there are other themes which are interwoven with them and which, like the harmony of a tune, impart to Athanasius’ exegesis added richness and depth.²³² For instance, Athanasius’ argument, on the basis of such texts as 1 Cor 2:10, 2 Cor 12:4, Rom 11:33,34 and Heb 11:6, that the Spirit’s nature is ultimately incomprehensible, weds the trinitarian motif of the indivisibility of the Godhead to the belief, common to most Christian authors of the fourth century, that God’s nature is incomprehensible. Because the Spirit is indivisibly one with the Father and the Son, whose nature is acknowledged to be incomprehensible, it follows that the nature of the Spirit is also incomprehensible. Or again, from 1 Cor 2:11-12, the Alexandrian bishop argues that the preposition “from” (ἐκ) indicates that the Spirit has an uncreated nature, while the preposition “in” (ἐν) demonstrates that he is one in being with the Father. Although the whole argument presupposes the trinitarian motif, another theme comes to the foreground at this point, namely that between Creator and creature there is an absolute and qualitative gap. The Spirit is either

²³⁰ See Shapland, *Letters*, p. 174, n.3.

²³¹ See pp. 65-66.

²³² Cf. Dietrich Ritschl [“Athanasius, Source of New Questions”, *JES*, I (1964), 322] who makes the comment that Athanasius’ theology “starts neither abstractly with the pre-existent Logos nor pragmatically with the Church, but...begins at several points simultaneously.” See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 181-182.

Creator or creature; if he has an uncreated nature and is one in being with the Father, he must be the former.

The results of the prepositional exegesis of 1 Cor 2:11-12 can also be used in the service of the christological motif. According to 2 Cor 13:3 and Phil 1:19, the gift of prophetic speech is imparted to Paul by both the Son and the Spirit. Therefore, Athanasius maintains, the Spirit cannot be separated from the Son, but must be in (ἐν) the Son, and by implication, also in (ἐν) the Father. Thus, the christological motif, like the trinitarian one, can be dovetailed with other themes. Another example of this dovetailing occurs in the exposition of 1 Cor 12:13 and 1 Cor 10:4. Despite the fact that the nature of the triune God is ultimately incomprehensible, Athanasius is well aware that the Biblical exegete has to say something about the triune God and his activity in the world. He suggests that one way of doing so is by means of Biblical illustrations. For example, the illustration of fountain (πηγή)-river (ποταμός), which Athanasius had employed frequently in defence of the Son's divinity, is extended in these letters to embrace the Spirit. On the authority of 1 Cor 12:13 and 1 Cor 10:4, which describe respectively the believer's experience of "drinking" of the Spirit and of the Son, the Spirit can take up his proper place as the third element of the illustration: "draught". Central to this exposition is not only the christological motif, but also the fact that "drinking" of the Spirit involves an immediate revelation of the Son, an intimation of what is a crucial epistemological principle for Athanasius: God is known and revealed by God alone.²³³ This principle is also present in Athanasius' use of the trinitarian motif to draw out the implications of the prepositions "from" and "in" of 1 Cor 2:11-12. The gift of the Spirit from the Father brings knowledge of the Son and the Father, which could not occur if the Spirit were less than divine. Moreover, his being in God means that the Spirit has intimate knowledge of the deep thoughts of God, thoughts which are hidden from the created realm.

When Athanasius interprets 1 Cor 6:11 and 2 Cor 2:15, the christological motif is coupled with yet another theme that is very important to Athanasius, namely, the soteriological.²³⁴ This theme has already been intimated in the first mention of the trinitarian motif: the reduction of the Spirit to the status of a creature imperils God's gracious activity on

²³³ See the discussion of this principle by McIntyre, "Holy Spirit", pp. 363-366.

²³⁴ See the comments by Pollard, *Johannine Christology*, pp. 132-136; Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, pp. 284-285; Lampe, "Christian Theology", p. 107.

behalf of men and women.²³⁵ The reason for this, as Athanasius' later exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6 and 2 Cor 13:13 in *ep. Serap.* 1.30-31 makes clear, is that it is the Spirit who actualizes this activity and its benefits in the lives of human beings. According to Athanasius' reading of 1 Cor 6:11, the Spirit sanctifies the creatures. Due to the fact that this activity is one that only God can perform, the Spirit must be regarded as divine. This conclusion is reinforced by Athanasius' belief that sanctification and creation are aspects of the same work. Moreover, on the basis of 2 Cor 2:15, believers can state that they are "the fragrance of Christ". However, this statement is possible only because the Spirit, who has the "fragrance" of Christ, imparts this "fragrance" to believers and so enables them to partake of Christ. Only if the Spirit is one in being with Christ, can such a participation be effected. This soteriological principle is also very prominent in the interpretation of 1 Cor 3:16-17, but this time in connection with the trinitarian motif. From the fact that believers are described as a "temple of God" which is indwelt by the Spirit of God, Athanasius concludes that the Spirit must be divine since he enables men and women both to partake of the Father and to be indwelt by the triune God, in short, to be deified. Since Athanasius believes that it is impossible for a being who himself partakes of God to enable others to do so,²³⁶ the activity of deification performed by the Spirit implies that he is divine by nature.

With regard to Athanasius' understanding of deification, R.C. Gregg and D.E. Groh have argued that Athanasius' "concretizing tendencies of his substantialist viewpoint" lead him to understand deification in terms of the elimination of the natural instability of human life. The core of Athanasius' soteriology thus focuses on a stable Godhead's transfer of an unstable mankind from the realm of mutability to that of immutability.²³⁷ Yet, it should be noted that Athanasius is not unaware of the ethical aspects of deification.²³⁸ More specifically, with regard to Athanasius' exegesis of the Corinthian correspondence in the letters to Serapion, the theme of the unchangeability of the Spirit as an argument for his divinity occurs only once, and that in connection with 1 Cor 2:11. Since the Spirit is in God, who is unchangeable, the Spirit is also unchangeable. Once again, the results of Athanasius' prepositional exegesis of 1 Cor 2:11-12

²³⁵ See pp. 65-66.

²³⁶ Gregg and Groh, *Early Arianism*, p. 107.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 106-107, 176-183.

²³⁸ See p. 91, n. 187. See also Andrew Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition. From Plato to Denys* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 78-80.

prove to be of use. Because the preposition “in” implies oneness in being, the statement “the Spirit is in God” means that the Spirit naturally shares in God’s unchangeable being, and so cannot be a creature.

One final motif which should be mentioned is that of worship, which, though it is never explicitly related to the exegesis of the Corinthian letters, is determinative for Athanasius’ exegesis and theology as a whole.²³⁹ For instance, in connection with the christological motif, Athanasius interprets Jn 4:23-24 to mean that true worship of the Father occurs only when confession of the divinity of the Son and his unity with the Spirit is made: “for the Spirit is inseparable from the Son, as the Son is inseparable from the Father”.²⁴⁰ And in a letter to the emperor Jovian, Athanasius states his theological position on the question of the Spirit when he links the trinitarian motif, so prominent in his letters to Serapion, with that of worship. The Nicene Fathers, Athanasius writes, gave to the Church a sound confession of the truth, for:²⁴¹

They did not alienate the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, but rather glorified him together with the Father and the Son in the one faith of the holy Trinity, because there is in fact one Godhead in the holy Trinity.

However, it is Basil, Athanasius’ successor in the struggle on behalf of the divinity of the Spirit, who makes the most striking use of this motif of worship. Basil reaps the fruit of Athanasius’ insights and employs them in his exegesis of, among other texts, passages from the Corinthian correspondence.

²³⁹ Ritschl, “Athanasius”, p. 322; Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 182,

²⁴⁰ *Ep. Serap.* 1.33 (PG 26.605D-608A). Trans. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 149.

²⁴¹ *Ep. Jov.* 4 (PG 26.820A). See also Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 121-122; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (3rd ed.; London: Longman Group Ltd., 1972), p. 342.

CHAPTER THREE

BASIL OF CAESAREA

1. Liber de Spiritu sancto

Prior to the Pneumatomachian controversy there existed in the Church no treatise which dealt satisfactorily with the subject of the Holy Spirit.¹ Orthodox authors, however, were not slow in producing such treatises when the need arose in the latter half of the fourth century. Athanasius' *ep. Serap.* 1-4.7 is the first of these treatises.² Basil's *Spir.*, although somewhat later chronologically, is at least as important a work as that of Athanasius. For, whereas Athanasius' theology of the Spirit was developed really only towards the end of his life, Basil's career can be described as a life-long preoccupation with the subject and person of the Holy Spirit, and *Spir.* is the culmination of that concern.³ Also, despite the fact that Athanasius' pneumatology exercised a great influence over subsequent authors, such as Didymus the Blind and Basil himself,⁴ it was

¹ Origen's discussion of the Spirit in *princ.* 1.3 (pp. 142-164; *PG* 11.145A-155C) and 2.7 (pp. 326-334; *PG* 11.215C-218C) was actually the first treatise on the Holy Spirit by a Greek patristic author. However, it failed to provide a satisfactory pneumatology. See pp. 9-18.

² Edeltraut Staimer ["Die Schrift 'De Spiritu Sancto' von Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandrien" (Unpublished theological dissertation, Munich, 1960), pp. 118-133, 143, 172-173] claims that Didymus' *Spir.* was probably written between 355 and 358, before Athanasius wrote his letters to Serapion. However, Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", pp. 30-34) and Heron ("Theologie", pp. 9-14) refute this claim. See also Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", p. 303, n. 181.

³ But, as with all great works, there was an immediate occasion which prompted the composition of *Spir.*, namely the doxological dispute with regard to the Spirit which led to Amphilochius' request for a theological clarification of the issue. The circumstances of this dispute have been noted above and need not be repeated here. See pp. 43-45.

⁴ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 172-176; Campbell, "Holy Spirit", pp. 438-439. On Basil's use of Athanasius' letters to Serapion, especially *ep. Serap.* 1, see Benoît Pruche, trans., *Basile de Cesarée: Traité du Saint-Esprit* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 17; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1945), pp. 87-94 (hereafter cited as *Traité*). Cf. Heising "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 289-290. Behind Basil's use of these letters is his belief that the Egyptian bishop was guided by the Spirit to a greater extent than any of his contemporaries [*ep.* 69.1 (I, 162.26-28; *PG* 32.429C-432A)]. It is therefore surprising to find no mention of Athanasius in *Spir.* 29.72-74 (pp. 139.19-147.5; *PG* 32.201B-208C) where Basil marshals support from such authors as Dionysius of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Origen, Julius Africanus and Gregory Thaumaturgus for his use of the preposition *σύν* in the doxological affirmation about the Holy Spirit. J. Coman ["La Démonstration dans le traité *Sur le Saint Esprit* de saint Basile le Grand", *SP*, IX (1966), 200] suggests that the omission of Athanasius' name stems from the fact that the Alexandrian was detested by the Pneumatomachi. To spare his adversaries, Basil passed over in silence the name of the orthodox bishop. If this is the case, it shows once

Basil's theology of the Spirit which, partly through the mediation of Gregory of Nyssa, was decisive in the expansion of the third article of the Nicene Creed at the Council of Constantinople in 381.⁵

Basil's treatise can be divided into five major sections. Chapters 1 and 30 are, as Dörries rightly remarks, much more than the framework into which the rest of the treatise is fitted.⁶ Chapter 1 indicates those for whom the work is intended: Amphilochius of Iconium⁷ and others who are likeminded in their zealous, yet discreet, concern for the truth. Chapter 30 gives the reason for this: the situation of the Church is such that even the truth is used by some as an occasion for a new controversy.⁸

At the end of *Spir.* 1, Basil refers to the liturgical question about the conglorification of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son which was raised at the feast of the martyr Euphychius and which provided the immediate occasion for the composition of the treatise.⁹ His Pneumatomachian opponents had questioned the propriety of using the phrase "together with the Holy Spirit" in the doxology, since, for them, the Spirit's nature is radically different from that of the Father and the Son. But the section which follows, *Spir.* 2-8, an examination of the different prepositions which Scripture uses with regard to the members of the Godhead, seems to refute the Anomoeans rather than the

more Basil's basically irenic nature. On Basil's relationship with Athanasius, see also Reilly, *Imperium*, pp. 77-85.

⁵ See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 174-176; *idem*, "Basilius", pp. 141-142, 143; Staats, "Basilianische Verherrlichung", pp. 238-239. On the key role played by Gregory of Nyssa in the expansion of the third article, see pp. 199-201.

⁶ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 44.

⁷ On Amphilochius, see pp. 44, 182.

⁸ Pp. 150.1-157.11: PG 32.209D-217C. For Dörries (*De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 44-46, 121-128, 159-161; "Basilius", pp. 126-130), *Spir.* was written specifically for a circle of monks among whom Amphilochius was prominent. These believers, engaged in a task of becoming "spiritual men" (πνευματικοί), will be prudent and discreet in their discussion of the question of the Holy Spirit. They will not profane Basil's work by rashly displaying it for all to see. Although Pruche ["Autour du Traité sur le Saint-Esprit de saint Basile de Césarée", *RSR*, LII (1964), 216-217, 223-231; *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 89-93, 117-131] objects vigorously to the characterization of *Spir.* as a "monastic" work, he does admit that Basil never intended his treatise on the Spirit to be a public work ("Autour du Traité", p. 225). Pruche disagrees with Dörries when he argues that *Spir.* was written for all who were baptized, and specifically for the bishops who were in the front lines of the struggle against the Pneumatomachi.

Yet, see the conciliatory statement of Gribomont ("Intransigence", p. 129): "It would certainly be wrong to oppose in too simplistic a way, especially at this period and in this milieu, monachism and Christian life. Dörries himself has perhaps tended to exaggerate this opposition or this distinction. In an age when infant baptism was but scarcely practised, monastic initiation was confused with the baptismal option, as was the case with Basil himself. The milieu in which his theology was elaborated was typically episcopal but Basil, Eustathius, and their friends behaved with an evangelical radicalism, which closely corresponds to what will later be called monachism."

⁹ See pp. 43-45

Pneumatomachi.¹⁰ However, the question about the Spirit's conglorification is not forgotten. In *Spir.* 6-8 the reader is provided with a summary of the reasons why he should glorify the Son alongside the Father. With this christological base established, Basil proceeds to argue the same for the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the core of the treatise, *Spir.* 10-27, contains the debate between Basil and his old friend Eustathius over this very question of the Spirit's conglorification. Thus, this doxological question is more than simply the immediate occasion for the composition of *Spir.* As the major pattern in the tapestry of the treatise, it provides the treatise with coherence.

Dörries has noted the special position which the next section, chapter 9, occupies in the treatise.¹¹ It makes no mention of the themes which are prominent in *Spir.* 2-8; nor does it develop the doctrine of the Spirit from the trinitarian formula of Mt 28:19, which is central to the rest of the book. Furthermore, it is free of polemic; in Dörries' words, it breathes the tranquil air of a monastic retreat.¹² Finally, the chapter has a peculiar manuscript history: it is found in the transmission of the "Macarian" literature and was adopted by the Messalians as a work of one of their own leaders.¹³

Nonetheless, Basil's authorship of the chapter ought not to be doubted, for it has definite thematic links to the work of which it forms a part.¹⁴ Thus, Dörries reasons that chapter 9 was originally composed at some other time than the rest of *Spir.*, probably for a monastic audience, and then, because of its value, inserted by Basil at the head of his pneumatological exposition.¹⁵

Benoît Pruche¹⁶ is critical of Dörries' reasoning at this point. He argues that the themes of *Spir.* 9 are not peculiar to that chapter, but can be found at various places in the second half of the treatise (*Spir.* 10-27), especially in *Spir.* 19. If *Spir.* 9 is seen as an independent work, then theoretically *Spir.* 19 should be considered also as a separate tract. To be sure, Dörries does not deny that there are parallels between chapters 9 and 10-27.¹⁷ Rather, it is the differences between chapter 9 and the rest

¹⁰ For an analysis of *Spir.* 2-8, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 46-51; Coman, "Démonstration", pp. 178-186; Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 111-112, 126-127.

¹¹ *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 54-56.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 54.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55. See also Jaeger, "Basilius", pp. 257-258; Vincent Desprez, "Les Relations entre le Pseudo-Macaire et s. Basile" in Jean Gribomont, ed., *Commandements du Seigneur et libération évangélique* (Rome: Editrice Anselmiana, 1977), p. 210.

¹⁴ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 55.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

¹⁶ "Autour du Traite", pp. 216-217. Cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 212-213, n. 33.

¹⁷ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 55.

of the treatise, especially the peculiar manuscript history of *Spir.* 9 and the total absence of any polemic against the Pneumatomachi in this chapter, that leads Dörries to posit a separate origin for *Spir.* 9.¹⁸ Werner Jaeger¹⁹ concurs with Dörries' judgment that *Spir.* 9 was originally an independent tract. However, he suggests that the chapter may have a polemical aspect. *Spir.* 9 was not composed for monks, as Dörries has argued. Rather, since it employs distinctive philosophical concepts, notably Platonic and Plotinian,²⁰ it may have been written by Basil as a counter to the Pneumatomachian use of rationalistic arguments to deny the Spirit's oneness in being with the Father and Son. But surely if, as Jaeger suggests, *Spir.* 9 was a response to the rationalistic arguments employed by the Pneumatomachi, it would have a polemical stamp like the rest of *Spir.* But it is, as Dörries notes, entirely free of polemic.

As for the date of the composition of *Spir.* 9, the close thematic links between it and the rest of *Spir.*²¹ seem to indicate that it was composed *ca.* 374-375, at approximately the same time as the rest of the treatise. Gribomont²² admits that this chapter could antedate the rest of the treatise. Yet, as a dogmatic and mystical synthesis, it could also be "the last touch given to the whole statement on an inspired day". There is nothing inherently improbable in this suggestion about the chronological relationship between *Spir.* 9 and the rest of the treatise. But it should be borne in mind that originally *Spir.* 9 was intended probably as a separate tract, as Dörries has observed, and is therefore more than simply "a last touch".

A tentative conclusion about *Spir.* 9 may thus be stated as follows: it

¹⁸ See also Gribomont, "Esotérisme", p. 41.

¹⁹ "Basilius", p. 258.

²⁰ According to Dehnhard (*Problem*, pp. 85-86), *Spir.* 9 does not use Plotinus directly, but relies on the use of Plotinus by *DS*, which Dehnhard believes to have been written by Basil ten to fifteen years prior to *Spir.* (*ibid.*, pp. 66-67). Yet Dehnhard's arguments for the Basilian authorship of *DS* are by no means conclusive. Both Gribomont ("Comptes rendus: Hans Dehnhard, *Problem*", pp. 487-492; see pp. 277-278, n. 83) and Rist ("Basil's Neoplatonism", pp. 190-220; see pp. 25-26, n. 83) have presented weighty arguments against Basil's authorship of the Plotinian cento. Rist convincingly demonstrates that although *Spir.* 9 does employ Plotinian texts, it is not by way of *DS*. Rather *Spir.* 9 has direct access to some of the texts of the Neo-Platonist ("Basil's Neoplatonism", pp. 215-218). Rist attributes Basil's acquaintance with Plotinus to the influence of his younger brother. Gregory of Nyssa's growing interest in Plotinus in the 370's sparked Basil's reading of the Neo-Platonic philosopher (*ibid.*, p. 218). The validity of this argument is not dependent on Rist's opinion that Gregory of Nyssa is the author of *DS*. For other analyses of the philosophical concepts of *Spir.* 9, see Werner Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1954), pp. 100-103; Mario Girardi, "Le 'nozioni comuni sullo Spirito Santo' in Basilio Magno", *VeC*, XII (1976), 269-288.

²¹ See p. 106 above.

²² "Intransigence", p. 128.

is a tract composed with the use of Plotinian texts independently of, and probably after, the rest of *Spir.* For Basil it is more than simply a transitional section between the two parts of his treatise. It is valued as a tranquil resting-place in the midst of the controversy about the Spirit, a place where the reader can contemplate undisturbed the lofty nature of the one whose divine glory Basil will set forth in the following chapters.

Spir. 10-27 has been a field of controversy among recent scholars. Dörries argues that the basis of these chapters was the discussion that Basil had with Eustathius at Sebaste in June 372.²³ Dörries distinguishes twenty antitheses which Basil discusses in *Spir.* 10-27.²⁴ Their form and content make it very unlikely that Basil has composed the objections in order to enliven his treatise.²⁵ The sequence in which these objections are cited also rules out the possibility that Basil has before him a work of his Pneumatomachian opponent and is criticizing those sentences with which he disagrees, as he did with Eunomius in *Eun.* 1-3. The opponent is able to voice his misgivings about Basil's statements; this would be possible only in an actual dialogue.²⁶ According to Dörries, the opponent's objections and Basil's answers were recorded by tachygraphers at the time of the discussion. Later, when Basil came to write his treatise for Amphilochius, he edited the protocol and substantially expanded his own contribution.²⁷ Since Basil's treatise is especially directed against the position of the Pneumatomachi, it is clear that the opponent in *Spir.* 10-27 must belong to this circle.²⁸ As to the identity of this opponent, the logical choice is Eustathius of Sebaste, the former friend of Basil, but now his embittered opponent and the leader of the Pneumatomachi in northern Asia Minor. Dörries further believes that the verbal and conceptual agreements between *Spir.* and *ep.* 125, which records the statement drawn up by Basil in 373 to ascertain Eustathius' orthodoxy,²⁹ verifies his hypothesis.³⁰

As to why Basil made use of the transcript from the colloquy at Sebaste, Dörries gives a number of reasons.³¹ First, at the time of Amphilochius' request for an answer to the liturgical question raised at

²³ Dörries believes that this discussion took place in 372. It probably occurred however in the following year.

²⁴ *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 81-85. Cf. Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen".

²⁵ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 85; "Basilius", p. 123.

²⁶ *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 85.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

²⁹ See pp. 37-38

³⁰ *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 88-90.

³¹ *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 91-93, 179. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 29.

the feast of the martyr Euppsychius there existed no written works by the Pneumatomachi. It was only in Basil's transcript that the thoughts of the Pneumatomachi could be found in readable form. Second, the transcript was an ideal basis for his book, for here Basil's main ideas were already formed and simply needed expansion and refinement. Third, the transcript contained Basil's personal confession of faith; it needed only to be fashioned into a form valid for others. Finally, Basil would certainly have seen the outcome of the colloquy as a triumph of the Spirit himself. Thus, the gifts given by the Spirit on that occasion should be preserved.

Approval of Dörries' hypothesis has been given by Gribomont,³² Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta,³³ Heising,³⁴ R.P.C. Hanson,³⁵ Kei Yamamura,³⁶ and Fedwick.³⁷ Gribomont, in an early article,³⁸ stressed that the protocol as it is found in *Spir.* 10-27 was very faithful to the colloquy at Sebaste, although Dörries had maintained that Basil edited his notes from his conversation with Eustathius. But, after criticism by Pruche on this point,³⁹ Gribomont has conceded that Basil's arguments may have been clarified and padded with new texts. Nonetheless, the physiognomy of the discussion is still clearly distinguishable.⁴⁰ Gribomont⁴¹ also proposes that *Spir.* 10-16 may contain the results of the first day of the conversation; *Spir.* 17, in which Gribomont finds a summary of Eustathius' concessions to that point, would thus contain the beginning of the second day's dialogue, and *Spir.* 18-27 would record the subsequent discussion of that day. Furthermore, he thinks that it is possible to differentiate between Eustathius' own objections, which have a Biblical tone, and those of the more rationalistic Poimenius, a presbyter of Eustathius. However, Gribomont does question whether the discussion was recorded by tachygraphers. Possibly Basil himself wrote down his recollections shortly afterwards.⁴²

In an important review of Dörries' book, Henry Chadwick⁴³ considers

³² "H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*", pp. 452-453; "Eustathe", col. 33; "Esotérisme", pp. 40-41; "Intransigence", pp. 126-128.

³³ *APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS*, pp. 21-24.

³⁴ "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 292-293.

³⁵ "Tradition", p. 252.

³⁶ "The Development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Patristic Philosophy: St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa", trans. H.G. Seraphim, *SVTQ*, XVIII (1974), 5-6.

³⁷ *Charisma*, p. 149.

³⁸ "Eustathe de Sébaste", col. 1710.

³⁹ "Autour du Traité", p. 205, n. 6.

⁴⁰ "Intransigence", p. 127.

⁴¹ "H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*", p. 453; "Intransigence", p. 127.

⁴² "Intransigence", p. 127.

⁴³ "Literarische Berichte", p. 335.

the hypothesis of a protocol “an attractive idea”, which could find support in *ep.* 223.5, where Basil refutes a charge of being an Apollinarian:⁴⁴

And at Eusinae, when you were about to set out for Lampascus with other bishops, and you summoned me, was not our discussion about the faith? Were not your tachygraphers at my side all the time while I was dictating my [objections] to the heresy?

But the tachygraphers mentioned in this letter are Eustathius’ and thus this reference has little weight in determining Basil’s own practice.⁴⁵ Chadwick goes on to posit an alternate source for the Eustathian citations in *Spir.*: the manifesto of Cyzicus, which Chadwick believes was signed by Eustathius in 375.⁴⁶ However, in 376, after the completion of *Spir.*, Basil wrote to Patrophilus, bishop of Aegea, that he was ignorant of the contents of this manifesto, but he had heard:⁴⁷

...that they were silent about the ‘oneness in being’, and now vaunt the ‘likeness in being’, and with Eunomius compose blasphemies against the Holy Spirit.

It is extremely improbable that such a scant oral report could provide the substance for the citations given in *Spir.* 10-27! Furthermore, the Synod of Cyzicus probably took place in 376, not in 375, as Chadwick states,⁴⁸ and thus it occurred after Basil had finished writing *Spir.*

Pruche, in an article and a section of his introduction to his revised edition of *Spir.*,⁴⁹ has also been critical of the hypothesis that *Spir.* 10-27 is based upon a protocol of the colloquy at Sebaste, as it has been set forth by Dörries and his French advocate, Gribomont. First, Pruche believes that there is virtually no evidence upon which it can be argued that Basil habitually employed tachygraphers. The reference in *ep.* 223.5 is rightly seen to have little weight for such an argument.⁵⁰ The reference in *ep.* 134 to *ταχυγράφων* is also dismissed as inconsequential since, according to Pruche, it refers to simply “copyists”, not “tachygraphers”.⁵¹ Second, Pruche concedes that Basil would have regarded his discussion with Eustathius as one of great importance, but he goes on to state that any notes which Basil may have retained from the colloquy would be only those he had prepared in advance.⁵² Third, Pruche argues that Basil

⁴⁴ III, 14.5-9; *PG* 32.829A.

⁴⁵ Cf. Pruche, “Autour du Traité,” p. 218.

⁴⁶ “Literarische Berichte”, p. 335.

⁴⁷ *Ep.* 244.9 (III, 83,22-24; *PG* 32.924B).

⁴⁸ See p. 45.

⁴⁹ “Autour du Traité”, pp. 205, n. 6; 216-222; *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 115-123.

⁵⁰ “Autour du Traité”, pp. 217-218.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

⁵² *ibid.*, p. 218.

had no need to record Eustathius' objections, for he would have known them by heart from his many arguments with Arians and Homoiousians.⁵³ Thus, Basil may simply have assembled the major arguments of the Pneumatomachi prior to the composition of *Spir.*, and inserted them into the flow of his discussion, in order to provide Amphilochius and other orthodox bishops with ammunition for the defence of the faith.⁵⁴ Pruche finds the confirmation of his suggestion about the Pneumatomachian antitheses in *epp.* 105, 159 and 125. The internal logic which orders the development of the objections in the treatise on the Holy Spirit is the same as that which inspires the ordering of the theses in *ep.* 125 and is also transparent in *epp.* 105 and 159.⁵⁵ Thus, he reasons that if *Spir.* is based upon any document, it is most probably *ep.* 125.⁵⁶ Finally, evidence within *Spir.*, namely the "striking parallelism" between *Spir.* 6-8 and 10-15, demonstrates that *Spir.* 1-9 and 10-27 are a unity.⁵⁷

Criticism of Dörries' suggestion that the conversation of Sebaste was recorded by tachygraphers has come not only from Pruche, but also, as noted above, from Gribomont, Dörries' advocate. However, a cursory examination of Basil's letters does indeed reveal that he did, on occasion, employ tachygraphers. In *ep.* 134 Basil clearly distinguishes between calligraphers (καλλιγραφούντων) and tachygraphers (ταχυγράφων):⁵⁸

There has not been a scribe near me, neither a calligrapher (καλλιγραφούντων) nor a tachygrapher (ταχυγράφων). For of those whom I happen to have trained, some have gone back to their former way of life, and the others, suffering from chronic ill health, have given up the work.

In Basil's day, whereas calligraphers were employed for their artistic ability, tachygraphers were used for their speed.⁵⁹ The tachygraphers of the fourth century not only copied letters and transcribed homilies quickly,⁶⁰ but also, if the need arose, could be used to record a protocol.⁶¹

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 220; *Saint-Esprit*, p. 131.

⁵⁴ "Autour du Traité", p. 220, n. 55; *Saint-Esprit*, p. 131.

⁵⁵ *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 131-136.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 134-136.

⁵⁷ "Autour du Traité", pp. 211-212, 214, 217; *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 124, 129.

⁵⁸ II, 48.15-16; *PG* 32.572A.

⁵⁹ Yves Courtonne, *Un Témoin du IV^e siècle oriental. Saint Basile et son temps d'après sa correspondance* (Paris: Société d'Éditions 'Les Belles Lettres', 1973), p. 12. On the distinction between calligraphers and tachygraphers, see also Joseph de Ghellinck, "Diffusion et transmission des écrits patristiques" in his *Patristique et Moyen Age* (Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1947), II, 217.

⁶⁰ Gregory of Nazianzus, *or.* 42.26 (*PG* 36.492A); Alfred Wikenhauser, "Der heilige Hieronymus und die Kurzschrift", *TQ*, XCII (1910), 52; H.I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956), p. 312.

⁶¹ Wikenhauser, "Kurzschrift", pp. 52-53; W.H. Gross, "Tachygraphoi", *KP*, V (1975), 486.

In the light of the contemporary use of tachygraphy, and Basil's own testimony, Dörries is probably correct when he suggests that the protocol of Sebaste was recorded for Basil by his tachygraphers. Apropos of Pruche's second point, Basil may have gone to Sebaste with rough notes of what he intended to say, but Dörries' thesis that Basil came away from the meeting with a transcript of Eustathius' replies and objections is not thereby refuted.

Also, as Dörries has argued and Hauschild has confirmed,⁶² an actual discussion, which ends in an apparent victory for Basil, is indeed recognizable in *Spir.* 10-27. Basil has not, as Pruche reasons, produced a patchwork of Pneumatomachian assertions from a number of discussions he had held with various opponents. In reality, there is very little difference between Pruche's hypothesis about the origin of the Pneumatomachian statements in *Spir.* 10-27 and the hypothesis which Dörries ably refutes, that Basil himself had composed the objections in order to enliven his treatise.⁶³ Both of these suggestions fail to take account of the obvious flow of dialogue which these chapters reveal. As for the similarity of the order of theses in *epp.* 105, 159 and 125, on the one hand, and *Spir.* 10-27, on the other, this proves nothing more than that all of these works are by the same author. That Basil's thought about the Holy Spirit had been focused on certain points before the discussion at Sebaste, points which Basil raised at that discussion, in no way invalidates Dörries' thesis. A key reason for Pruche's emphasis that there is an identical logic at work in *epp.* 105, 159 and 125, and *Spir.* 10-27 is his fear that Dörries' thesis leads to the affirmation that Eustathius' pneumatology influenced Basil.⁶⁴ However, Dörries' work does not necessarily lead to such a conclusion and Dörries has explicitly said so.⁶⁵

Further support for Dörries' thesis is given by Hauschild, despite the fact that he criticizes Dörries' reasoning in a couple of areas.⁶⁶ Eustathius' puzzling ratification of a document (*ep.* 125), which in essential points contradicts his basic Pneumatomachian beliefs, can be explained in light of the fact that he lost the argument upon which *Spir.* 10-27 is based. The Pneumatomachian objections which Dörries has isolated clearly reveal the evasiveness, helplessness and retreat of one who is losing.⁶⁷ Moreo-

⁶² "Pneumatomachen", pp. 39-41.

⁶³ See p. 108.

⁶⁴ "Autour du Traité", pp. 204-205, 218-219, 220, 222. This fear also seems present in Pruche's vigorous protest against the suggestion that Basil had a "monastic" audience in mind when he composed *Spir.*

⁶⁵ "Basilius", p. 124, n. 7b.

⁶⁶ "Pneumatomachen", pp. 39-43

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

ver, the agreement between the Pneumatomachian position in *Spir.* 10-27 and the statement attributed to Eustathius by Socrates,⁶⁸ as well as what is said of Eustathius' views in Basil's *ep.* 251.4,⁶⁹ are seen by Hauschild as further confirmation of Dörries' thesis.⁷⁰

To conclude: it is most probable that the basis of *Spir.* 10-27 is the protocol of the colloquy between Basil and Eustathius at Sebaste in 373,⁷¹ which was recorded by Basil's own tachygraphers. However, this protocol has been revised, edited, and substantially expanded by Basil so that it could form the core of his treatise on the Holy Spirit.

The final section of the treatise, *Spir.* 28-29, an appeal to the tradition of the Church, has also been an area of controversy in recent years.⁷² It is sufficient to note that it was written at the same time as *Spir.* 1-8 and 30.

In the following analysis of Basil's exegesis of 1 and 2 Cor, the translations of Basil's works are those of the author, although existing translations of his treatise on the Holy Spirit, letters, homilies and ascetic works have been consulted.⁷³

⁶⁸ *H.e.* 2.45 (PG 67.360A-B): "I neither chose to name the Holy Spirit God nor dare to call him a creature". See also Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 5, n. 4.

⁶⁹ III, 92.7-16; PG 32.937B-C: "For as we received from the Lord, so are we baptized; as we are baptized, so we believe. As we believe, so also do we glorify. We neither separate the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son, nor place him before the Father, or say that he is prior to the Son, as blasphemous tongues fabricate. For who is so reckless as to reject the Lord's commandment and dare to invent his own order for the names? But we neither say that the Spirit, who is ranked with the Father and Son, is a creature nor dare to call him who is sovereign a slave".

⁷⁰ "Pneumatomachen", pp. 41-42. However, Hauschild is not as confident as Dörries that all of the Pneumatomachien antitheses contained in *Spir.* 10-27 are directly from the mouth of Eustathius. He is of the opinion that these objections are an authentic stock of ideas from Eustathius. Thus, the Pneumatomachi fought in *Spir.* could be followers of Eustathius ("Pneumatomachen", p. 42).

⁷¹ On the date, see pp. 36-38; 36, n. 135.

⁷² The controversy surrounds Basil's understanding of tradition in *Spir.* 27-29 and its role in his defence of the Holy Spirit's divinity. See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 73-78, 163-165; Hanson, *Tradition*, pp. 181-184; Amand de Mendieta, *APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS, passim*; Gribomont, "Esotérisme", pp. 48-56; Hanson, "Tradition", pp. 244-245; Yamamura, "Development", pp. 14-18; Kretschmar, "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 96-99.

⁷³ For *Spir.*: Jackson, *St. Basil*, pp. 2-50; David Anderson, trans., *St. Basil the Great: On the Holy Spirit* (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980); for the letters: Jackson, *St. Basil*, pp. 109-327; A.C. Way, trans., *Saint Basil: Letters* (The Fathers of the Church, vols. 13 and 28; New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1951, 1955); for the homilies: A.C. Way, trans., *Saint Basil: Exegetic Homilies* (The Fathers of the Church, vol. 46; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963); for the ascetic works: Clarke, *Ascetic Works*; M.M. Wagner, trans., *Saint Basil: Ascetic Works* (The Fathers of the Church, vol. 9; New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1950). The selections in Henry Bettenson, ed. and trans., *The Later Christian Fathers* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 59-98 and the translation of *Spir.* 9 by Cyril Karam, "Saint Basil on the Holy Spirit—Some Aspects of His Theology", *WS*, I (1979), 161-163 have also been consulted.

2. Basil as Exegete

Basil's unshakable conviction that the Scriptures contain the norm for every area of the Christian life is evident from all that he wrote.⁷⁴ The origin of this conviction, according to Hans von Campenhausen,⁷⁵ was Basil's clear realization that many of the theologians of his day had been seized, as it were, by a mania for controversy and theological hair-splitting, and consequently had ceased to concern themselves with the essence of the Christian faith, namely, the adoration of the triune God. As a solution to this problem, Basil endeavoured to introduce to the Church as a whole that life which was found in the monastic community, a life which was nourished by the example of the early Christian Church as it was portrayed principally in the New Testament. In this way, Basil believed an environment could be created in which true theological dialogue could take place, the fruit of which would glorify the triune God.

An explicit testimony to the way in which Basil sought to fulfill this desire in his own life is offered by the small treatise *fid.*, written to one of his monastic communities shortly before the outbreak of the Pneumatomachian controversy.⁷⁶ As a theologian who sought to conform his theology to the Scriptures, Basil sees himself as an imitator of both the Lord Jesus, who spoke only what he was authorized to say by the Father (Jn 12:49,50), and the Holy Spirit, who speaks only what he hears from the Son (Jn 16:13).⁷⁷ Consequently, although the confession of faith which Basil sets forth in this treatise does not exhaust the wealth of Scriptural statements about the Godhead, Basil is convinced that it is Scriptural; for it employs numerous and varied descriptions taken from the Scriptures concerning the persons of the Godhead.⁷⁸

Thus, when the struggle with the Pneumatomachi over the divinity of

⁷⁴ See the comments by Piero Scazzoso, "San Basilio e la Sacra Scrittura", *Ae*, XLVII (1973), 210-212, 214; Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, "The official attitude of Basil of Caesarea as a Christian bishop towards Greek philosophy and science" in Derek Baker, ed., *The Orthodox Churches and the West* (Studies in Church History, vol. 13; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976), pp. 25-49, *passim*; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 45, n. 35.

⁷⁵ *The Fathers of the Greek Church*, trans. Stanley Godman (New York: Pantheon Books Inc., 1959), pp. 88-89, 92-93.

⁷⁶ For the date of *fid.*, see excursus II. For an analysis of this treatise, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 14-18.

⁷⁷ *Fid.* 1 (PG 31.677A-C). In *jud.* 4 (PG 31.660B-C) Basil uses these texts from Jn to argue that if both the Son and the Spirit act with such harmony, then the Church should follow suit. Cf. also *reg.br.* 1 (PG 31.1080C-1081C).

⁷⁸ *Fid.* 2-4 (PG 31.680D-688B).

the Spirit began, Basil went above all to the Scriptures for direction.⁷⁹ For instance, in *ep.* 105, written in the very early stages of the conflict, Basil gives a short explication of the faith, which emphasizes the divine nature of the Spirit.⁸⁰ He then concludes:⁸¹

If the Lord ever allows us to meet, we shall provide you with a fuller exposition concerning the faith, so that by Scriptural proofs you may recognize both the power of the truth and the weakness of heresy.

Ep. 159, written in 374/375 to a certain Eupaterius and his daughter in response to a question about the Godhead,⁸² closes in a similar fashion. Basil begins by stating that although he reveres highly the confession set forth at the Council of Nicaea he feels required to add an explanation about the nature of the Spirit, since this matter was not an issue at that time. This explanation, he is confident, conforms to the description of the Spirit given in the Scriptures.⁸³ After he has given the explanation, Basil writes:⁸⁴

Let these words, a sort of summary, be sufficient for your piety. For from [these] little seeds you will be able to cultivate the greater part of the orthodox faith, with the assistance that the Spirit gives to you. 'Give an opportunity to a wise man and he will become wiser' [Prov 9:9]. We will defer the more perfect teaching till we talk face to face, at which time it will be possible to resolve objections, to produce fuller testimonies from the Scriptures and to confirm every sound formula of the faith.

The Scriptural proofs which Basil would have given in these private discussions were similar perhaps to those set down in writing in his treatise on the Holy Spirit, which he composed at the request of Amphilochius.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ Of course, this does not mean that Basil ignored what earlier Christian authors had said about the Spirit. For instance, Basil's debt to Athanasius is especially evident in *Spir.* See pp. 104-105, n. 4. And in *Spir.* 29 (pp. 138.1-149.25; *PG* 32.200B-209D) Basil cites a number of earlier authors in support of his doxological position.

⁸⁰ II, 6.20-7.34; *PG* 32.513A-B. See also the analysis of this letter by Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 21-22.

⁸¹ II, 7.34-38; *PG* 32.513B-C.

⁸² For the date, see Hauschild, *Briefe*, II, 169, nn. 168, 171; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 147.

⁸³ *Ep.* 159.1-2 (II, 86.10-87.31; *PG* 32.620B-621B). See also the analysis of this letter by Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 22-23.

⁸⁴ *Ep.* 159.2 (II, 87.31-39; *PG* 32.621B-C). Cf. *ep.* 52.4 (I, 137.22-25; *PG* 32.396C); 261.3 (III, 118.31-33; *PG* 32.972C). Although Basil seems to have preferred oral discussion to the written word, as did Plato and Plotinus [see J.M. Rist, *Plotinus: The Road to Reality* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967), p. 9], he did appreciate the power of the written word to transcend the limitations of time and space. See Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 170-173.

⁸⁵ It is important to bear in mind that *Spir.* also was intended originally for a small audience. See *Spir.* 30.79 (pp. 156.23-157.4; *PG* 32.217B). See also Jean Gribomont "Les Succès littéraires des Pères grecs et les problèmes d'histoire des textes", *SE*, XXII (1974-1975), 31.

J.J. Verhees,⁸⁶ however, regards these Scriptural proofs as the least interesting of Basil's arguments for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. To the reader of the twentieth century they are not very convincing and carry little theological weight.⁸⁷ But, as Greer has noted,⁸⁸ such a judgment overlooks a couple of important points. First, the Fathers did not differentiate between what a text "meant" and what it "means", since they regarded their works as theological enterprises rather than critical historical investigations. Consequently, they cannot be reproved for failing to adhere to the canons of historical criticism, which have been accepted only in the past couple of centuries. Second, the assumption that a patristic author may have misunderstood a Scriptural passage, which Verhees' judgment surely intimates, implies that "the correct interpretation" of that passage is known. However, in the final analysis, it must never be forgotten that all exegetes, including those of the modern era, read their presuppositions into the text.

Moreover, contrary to Verhees' position, it has been demonstrated by Jaroslav Pelikan in a recent article that Basil's theological method in *Spir.* is rooted in fact in exegesis.⁸⁹ Basil recognized that the exegetical evidence for the doctrine of the Spirit is far smaller than that for the Son. Since this is the case, a method of Biblical proof different from that which had been used with regard to the doctrine of the Son was required for that of the Spirit. Basil's exegetical proof for the Spirit's divinity thus argues not only directly from Biblical texts, but also uses as exegetical criteria the religious experience of believers and the tradition of the Church.⁹⁰ The religious experience of believers, or as Basil calls it at one point "the practice of the pious",⁹¹ provided keys that unlocked the depths of Scriptural passages.⁹² For instance, the comparison between the human spirit and divine Spirit found in 1 Cor 2:11 authorized, in Basil's view, the exploration of the human spirit as an analogy of the place of the Holy Spirit in the Godhead.⁹³ With regard to the second criterion, the appeal to the authority of an unwritten tradition, Basil was

⁸⁶ "Die Bedeutung der Transzendenz des Pneuma bei Basilius", *OS*, XXV (1976), 286. Cf. also the comment of G.W.H. Lampe [*God as Spirit* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), p. 223] about the "unimaginative and literalistic exegesis of certain proof texts" by the Fathers in their defence of the personal subsistence of the Spirit.

⁸⁷ "Transzendenz", pp. 286-288.

⁸⁸ *Captain*, pp. 2-3.

⁸⁹ "The 'Spiritual Sense' of Scripture. The Exegetical Basis for St. Basil's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit", in Fedwick, ed., *Basil of Caesarea*, pp. 337-360.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 345-360.

⁹¹ *Spir.* 7.16 (p. 37.13; *PG* 32.93C).

⁹² "Spiritual Sense", pp. 355-358.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 355-356

not seeking support from what he regarded as a second source of revelation alongside that of the Scriptures. Rather, he saw a harmonious relationship between the two, for the Fathers from whom this unwritten tradition came had themselves followed the meaning of Scripture.⁹⁴

Among the direct evidence in the Scriptures, Basil came to regard Mt 28:19 as the cornerstone of the orthodox case for the Spirit's divinity. The baptismal formula, which ranks the Spirit together with the Father and the Son, necessarily determines the form of the Church's confession of faith and doxology.⁹⁵ But it is a mistake to see this as the only text which was prominent in Basil's argument on behalf of the Spirit's divinity. There are large tracts of *Spir.* which are devoted to the examination of passages that employ different prepositions (namely ἐκ, διὰ, ἐν, σὺν and μετὰ) with regard to the members of the Trinity.⁹⁶ Moreover, Basil's exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6 plays a significant role in his demonstration that the distinctions between the persons of the Trinity are eternal and that of 2 Cor 3:17 has a special place in Basil's argumentation that the Spirit is divine.⁹⁷ Thus, despite the fact that Scripture was not replete with evidence for the Spirit's divinity, the faithful exegete would shape his exegesis according to the testimony of those Scriptures which were most explicit about the Spirit, of which the chief was Mt 28:19, and according to the experience and tradition of the Church.

Perhaps the clearest witness to this juxtaposition of Scripture, religious experience, and tradition is *Spir.* 9, where Basil undertakes an investigation of the common conceptions about the Spirit which are found in the Scriptures and in the unwritten tradition of the Fathers.⁹⁸ He writes:⁹⁹

Who is not aroused in his soul and does not raise his thought to the supreme nature when he hears the titles of the Spirit? For he is called 'Spirit of God' [Mt 12:28], 'Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father' [Jn 15:26], 'right Spirit' [Ps 51:10], 'sovereign Spirit' [Ps 51:12]. His principal and distinctive name is 'Holy Spirit', which is a name especially appropriate to everything that is incorporeal, purely immaterial and indivisible. Thus, the Lord taught the woman who thought God was to be worshipped in a place that what is incorporeal is not spatially limited, when he said, 'God is a Spirit' [Jn 4:24]. When one hears the term 'Spirit', it is impossible to picture a limited nature,

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 358-359, referring to *Spir.* 7.16 (pp. 37.24-38.1; *PG* 32.96A). See also Kretschmar, "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 98-99.

⁹⁵ "Spiritual Sense", pp. 346-347.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 347-353.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 353-354.

⁹⁸ *Spir.* 9.22 (p. 49.4-7; *PG* 32.108A).

⁹⁹ *Spir.* 9. 22-23 (pp. 50.1-54.8; *PG* 32.108A-109D). For a discussion of the relationship of this chapter to the rest of *Spir.*, see pp. 106-108.

or one that is subject to change and alteration, or, in short, one that is similar to the creature. Rather, advancing in thought to that which is highest, one is forced to conceive of an intellectual being, infinite in power, of unlimited greatness, immeasurable by time or ages [and] munificent with his good gifts. To him all things turn which have need of sanctification; he is the desire of all those who live virtuously, who are irrigated, as it were, by his inspiration and assisted [in their progress] towards their proper and natural end. He perfects all other beings, but he himself lacks nothing; he does not live adventitiously, but [is himself] the provider of life. He does not grow or increase, but is immediate fullness, firmly established in himself, and omnipresent. Source of sanctification, intelligible light, he offers through himself to every rational power a kind of clarity for the discovery of the truth. Unapproachable in nature, he is accessible on account of his goodness. Though he fills everything with his power, he himself is partaken of only by those who are worthy; and he is not partaken of according to a standard measure but distributes his activity according to the proportion of [our] faith. Simple in being, manifold in his powers, he is wholly present in each being, yet entirely present everywhere. He is divided without injury and shared without diminution. For as the sunbeam, whose lovely [light] comes to the one who enjoys it, as though it came to him alone, also shines upon earth and sea and mingles with the air; so the Spirit, present to everyone who is capable of receiving him, as though received by him alone, also pours forth his grace, which is sufficient and complete for all. [Moreover], those who partake of him enjoy him to the extent, not of his power, but of their nature.

The Spirit's fellowship with the soul does not consist of spatial approximation (for how could one approach the incorporeal in a corporeal fashion?), but in the exclusion of those passions which, on account of the soul's love for the flesh, afterwards attack it and estrange it from intimacy with God. Now then, only when one has been purified from the shame which he has received through evil, and has been returned to his natural beauty, and, so to speak, through purity had his original form restored to the royal image, is one able to approach the Paraclete. He, like the sun taking hold of a purified eye, will reveal to you in himself the invisible image, and in that blessed contemplation of the image you will see the unspeakable image of the archetype. Through him [comes] the lifting up of hearts, the guidance of the weak, and the perfection of those who are progressing. Just as when the sun's ray falls on bright and transparent objects, and they themselves become brilliant and a further light radiates from them, so those souls who bear the Spirit and who are illuminated by him, are themselves rendered spiritual and send forth their grace to others. From him [comes] foreknowledge of the future, understanding of mysteries, comprehension of hidden realities, distribution of spiritual gifts, the heavenly citizenship, a place in the choir of angels, everlasting joy, abiding in God, likeness to God, the highest of all desires: to become God. Such then, to mention only a few of many, are the conceptions about the Spirit which we have been taught by the oracles of the Spirit themselves to hold about his greatness, his dignity and his activities.

Although this passage has been the subject of much discussion in recent years,¹⁰⁰ it is sufficient for the purposes of this study to note that this text

¹⁰⁰ See the works listed at p. 107, n.20.

presents a number of themes which are extremely important to Basil. Perhaps the chapter's position, coming as it does prior to the more or less polemical treatment of the Spirit in *Spir.* 10-27, indicates that these themes are ones which Basil wishes the reader to keep in mind as he reads the rest of the treatise.¹⁰¹ However, it should be noted that not all of the themes which are important to Basil are present; for instance, there is no mention of baptism. Three motifs are particularly prominent: 1) the meaning behind the names given to the Spirit in Scripture, which culminates in a positive statement about the Spirit's being in *Spir.* 9.22¹⁰²; 2) the Spirit's sanctification of the soul in which he dwells, which makes it possible for that soul to achieve the highest of all desires: to become God; 3) that of "image-theology": the mind, illumined by the Spirit, sees in him the Son and in the Son, as in an image, contemplates the Father. It will be seen that these themes, along with one or two others, notably that of baptism, provide Basil with the theological basis for his exegesis of 1 and 2 Cor in *Spir.* 10-27.¹⁰³ As Gribomont has shown,¹⁰⁴ Basil's ascetic works and homilies on the Pss reveal a definite fondness for the letters of Paul, especially 1 Cor. This preference is also apparent in *Spir.*, where a number of the texts from the Corinthian correspondence play a significant role in Basil's argument:¹⁰⁵ 1) 1 Cor 12:3, 2:10 and 12:4-6 delineate the Spirit's role in the revelation of the Son and the Father; 2) 1 Cor 10:2, 12:11, 2 Cor 3:14-18 and 1 Cor 3:16 demonstrate

¹⁰¹ Cf. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 43.

¹⁰² See the discussion of this statement by Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 147-148.

¹⁰³ One final point should be noted concerning Basil's view about the essential prerequisite for true exegesis. The exegete who wishes to provide a faithful interpretation of the Scriptures must not only have a vital communion with the Holy Spirit, under whose inspiration the Scriptures were written, but also have the gift of discernment (τὸ χάρισμα τῆς διακρίσεως). This point, also a common theme in Origen, is evident in *ep.* 204.5 (II, 177.23-31; *PG* 32.75A-B).

Thus, when Basil writes in *Spir.* 30.77 (pp. 153.15-154.6; *PG* 32.213C) that Scripture is unable to mediate in the debate over trinitarian dogma, he is not suggesting that Scripture gives no indication concerning the true position in this debate. Rather, the blasphemy of the Sabellians, Arians and Pneumatomachi against the Holy Spirit entails a rejection of his guidance (in particular, a rejection of his gift of discernment) and consequently produces an inability to understand what the Scriptures say about him and the Trinity. Yet, to those who are considered worthy the Spirit imparts true insight into what is said about the Godhead in the Scriptures [cf. *Spir.* 30.79 (p. 157.8-11; *PG* 32. 217B-C)]. See also Thomas Špidlík, *La Sophologie de saint Basile* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, no. 162; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1961), pp. 167-172.

¹⁰⁴ "Les Règles Morales de saint Basile et le Nouveau Testament", *SP*, II (1957), 420-421, 424-426; "Le Paulinisme de saint Basile" in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus* (Analecta Biblica, vol. 18; Rome: E. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963), II, 482-484. Cf. *idem*, "Le Renoncement au monde dans l'idéal ascétique de saint Basile", *Ir*, XXXI (1958), 471 and n.l.

¹⁰⁵ Coman, "Démonstration", p. 198.

the deity of the Spirit from his activities; 3) 1 Cor 2:11-12, 14:24-25 and 12:4-6 clarify the relationships that hold between the Spirit and the Father and Son; and 4) 2 Cor 3:17-18 and 1 Cor 3:16 reveal the Spirit's divinity from his titles.

3. *The Spirit of Knowledge*

Basil's discussion with Eustathius opens with the latter's forthright assertion that the Holy Spirit should not be ranked alongside the Father and the Son because the Spirit's nature is different from theirs and his dignity is lower.¹⁰⁶ Basil's initial reply to this assertion is based upon the baptismal command in Mt 28:19.¹⁰⁷ If, in this command, the Lord Jesus united the Spirit with himself and the Father, then those who fail to regard the Spirit as on the same level as the Father and the Son are being disobedient to God.¹⁰⁸ Basil supports this answer with a personal testimony:¹⁰⁹

For if baptism was for me the beginning of life and that day of spiritual rebirth the first of days, then it is clear that the name which was uttered on the occasion of the grace of adoption was the most precious of all. Shall I therefore let myself be misled by the plausible arguments of these men and forsake the tradition which led me to the light, which graciously gave me the knowledge of God, through which I, formerly an enemy [of God] on account of my sin, was welcomed as a child of God? Indeed, for myself I pray that I go to the Lord with this confession. I urge them to preserve the faith inviolate until the day of Christ and to keep the Spirit inseparable from the Father and the Son, [thus] preserving, in the confession of the faith and in the doxology, the teaching [which was taught to them] at their baptism.

The confession of faith to which Basil refers in this text was made by the baptismal candidate in the church of Caesarea prior to his trine immersion in the water.¹¹⁰ In the light of this confession, the Pneumatomachian assertion about the status and nature of the Holy Spirit is a violation of

¹⁰⁶ *Spir.* 10.24 (pp. 56.1-57.2; *PG* 32.109D). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 56-57, 81.

¹⁰⁷ Wiles, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 81.

¹⁰⁸ *Spir.* 10. 24 (pp. 57.4-58.5; *PG* 32.112A-B). Cf. *fid.* 4 (*PG* 31.688A); *epp.* 91 (I, 198.31-36; *PG* 32.476C-D); 251.4 (III, 92.7-12; *PG* 32.937B-C); 159.2 (II, 86.5-12; *PG* 32.620C-621A).

¹⁰⁹ *Spir.* 10. 26 (p. 61.7-19; *PG* 32.113B-C). An analysis of this text is to be found in Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 57-58; *idem*, "Basilius", p. 132.

¹¹⁰ Georg Kretschmar, "Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche" in K.F. Muller and Walter Blankenburg, eds., *Leiturgia. Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes* (Kassel: Johannes Stauda-Verlag, 1970), V, 167-169. See also Ligier, *Confirmation*, pp. 129, 202.

the covenant which they made with God at their baptism and a denial of their faith.¹¹¹ Thus Basil writes in *Spir.* 11.27:¹¹²

I bear witness to every man who confesses Christ and denies God, that Christ will be of no advantage to him [cf. Gal 5:2], or to the one who calls upon God, but rejects the Son, that his faith is useless [cf. 1 Cor 15:17]. And [so I testify] to the one who rejects the Spirit, that his faith in the Father and Son will come to nothing, a faith which he cannot even have without the presence of the Spirit. For he who does not believe in the Spirit does not believe in the Son; and he who has not believed in the Son does not believe in the Father. 'For no one can say Jesus is Lord, except by the Holy Spirit' (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) [1 Cor 12:3] and 'no man has seen God at any time, but the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, has made him known to us' [Jn 1:18].¹¹³

There is no profit in the confession of the Son if that confession is coupled with the denial of the Father, just as faith in the Father is rendered ineffectual when accompanied by the rejection of the Son. In the same way, the Pneumatomachian repudiation of the Holy Spirit's divinity means that their faith in the Father and the Son is useless. The reason for this, Basil explains, is that confession of faith in the Father and the Son is possible only if the Spirit is present to inspire that confession. The Scriptural witness to this explanation is 1 Cor 12:3.¹¹⁴

1 Cor 12:3 is cited again in *Spir.* 16.38, but this time in connection with the angels. In this section of his treatise, Basil endeavours to show the inseparability of the Father, Son, and Spirit from their united activity in the creation of the angels. His opponents willingly conceded that the Spirit was active in sanctification but they refused to acknowledge the role he also played in creation. However, for Basil, if the Spirit is not involved in creation, then he would be less than divine.¹¹⁵ Thus, in the

¹¹¹ *Spir.* 11.27 (pp. 61.22-62.16; *PG* 32.113C-116A).

¹¹² P. 62.17-27; *PG* 32.116A-B.

¹¹³ On the textual differences between Basil's rendition of Jn 1:18 and the Johannine text, see Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, p. 342.

¹¹⁴ See Jean Daniélou, "Chrismation prébaptismale et divinité de l'Esprit chez Grégoire de Nysse", *RSR*, LVI (1968), 192-193.

¹¹⁵ Dehnhard (*Problem*, p. 38), believes that for Basil the divinity of the Spirit stood or fell on this point of the Spirit's involvement in creation. Nevertheless, Verhees ("Transzendenz", pp.289-291) has shown that Basil's argument for the Spirit's divinity from his creative activity is certainly not the most important argument that Basil marshals in support of his pneumatological position. In addition to this passage in *Spir.* 16.38, which really focuses on the sanctifying activity of the Spirit (Verhees, "Transzendenz", p. 291), there are two other texts concerning the creative activity of the Spirit which are worthy of note. The first is in *hex.* 2.6 (pp. 166.14-170.4; *PG* 29.41C-44C), where Basil gives an interpretation of Gen 1:2, and concludes that "this passage provides a sufficient explanation that the Holy Spirit is not lacking in creative power". On this interpretation, see also J.F. Callahan, "Greek Philosophy and the Cappadocian Cosmology", *DOP*, XII (1958), 44-45; Kretschmar, "Der Heilige Geist", p. 109 and n.33.

The other text in which Basil refers to the activity of the Spirit in creation is *struct. hom.*

creation of the angels all three persons of the Godhead are involved, though they are each the cause of their creation in a different way. The Father is the original cause (τὴν προκαταρκτικὴν αἰτίαν) of their creation, the Son the creative cause (τὴν δημιουργικὴν) and the Spirit the perfecting cause (τὴν τελειωτικὴν).¹¹⁶ After Basil has indicated that such a differentiation need not imply tritheism nor entail subordinationism,¹¹⁷ he continues:¹¹⁸

‘For by the word of the Lord the heavens were established (ἔσπερώθησαν), and by the breath (τῷ πνεύματι) of his mouth all their power’ [Ps 33:6]. [Here the term] ‘word’ [does not indicate] a significant sound that is uttered through the vocal organs. Nor [does the term] ‘breath’/‘Spirit’ [signify] an exhalation of the mouth that is expelled from the respiratory organs. But the Word is the one who was with God in the beginning and is God. And the Spirit is from the mouth of God, ‘the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father’ [Jn 15:26]. Thus, you are to perceive [these] three: the Lord who commands, the Word who creates, the Spirit who established (τὸ σπερεῶν). And what else could this establishment (σπερέωσις) be than perfection in sanctification, since [the word] ‘establishment’ implies steadfastness, immutability and firm entrenchment in the good? But there is no sanctification without the Spirit. For the heavenly powers are not naturally holy; otherwise there would be no difference between them and the Holy Spirit. Rather, it is in proportion to their relative excellence that they have the measure of their sanctification from the Spirit. For just as the branding iron is thought of along with the fire, and nevertheless the material is one thing and the fire another, so it is in the case of the heavenly powers. Their being is an aerial spirit, perhaps, or an immaterial fire, as it is written, ‘Who makes his angels spirits and his servants flames of fire’ [Ps 103:4] Yet, sanctification, which is extrinsic to their being, supplies them with perfection through their communion with the Spirit.

In Basil’s understanding, Ps 33:6 describes the particular function of the Spirit within the creative activity of the Godhead as “establishment”

1.4 (2-3) (pp. 172.2-176.28; PG 30.13A-D). There he argues that the first person plural is used in Gen 1:26 so that men, recognizing that the Father created through the Son, might glorify the Father in the Son and the Son in the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, the statement of Gen 1:27, that God made man, is given in order that men, conceiving of the Godhead as a unity, might ascribe one glory to the three hypostases of the Godhead. Although Basil’s authorship of this homily has been doubted, a number of scholars now hold that this work is indeed Basil’s. See Alexis Smets and Michel van Esbroeck, eds. and trans., *Basile de Césarée: Sur l’origine de l’homme* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 160; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970), pp. 13-126; Jean Daniélou, *L’Être et les temps chez Grégoire de Nysse* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970), pp. 89-90; Gribomont, “Succès”, pp. 38-40; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 152-153. The notes of this homily as well as those of *struct. hom. 2* were probably edited by a “modest” secretary after Basil’s death in 379 (Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 152).

¹¹⁶ Pp. 79.6-24; PG 32.136B. See also McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, p. 356; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 149; M.A. Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation according to St. Basil of Caesarea* (Athens: [G. Parisianos], 1975), p. 19.

¹¹⁷ Pp. 79.24-80.7; PG 32.136B-C. See also the discussion by Heising, “Der Heilige Geist”, pp. 296-297.

¹¹⁸ Pp. 80.7-81.5, 81.7-9; PG 32.135C-137A, 137A.

(στερέωσις). A further elaboration of this description follows: the Spirit provides perfection in sanctification, that is, an unshakable adherence to what is good. Thus, it is the Spirit who enables the angels, and by inference men and women,¹¹⁹ to be holy. The holiness of the angels is not inherent, but results from their communion with the Spirit. If this were not the case, there would be no difference between the Spirit and the angels. This point is clarified by the illustration of the branding-iron. When a branding-iron is placed in a fire, it acquires the qualities of the fire but it does not cease to be a branding-iron. Similarly, the angels, by their communion with the Holy Spirit, acquire their sanctification from his inherent holiness.¹²⁰

However, their perseverance in this sanctification does not occur without the exercise of their free will. As Basil explains:¹²¹

[The heavenly powers] retain their rank by being steadfast in goodness and although they keep their free will, they never lapse from their assiduous attention to that which is truly good. So if you do away with the Spirit, the choirs of angels cease to exist, the authority of the archangels is destroyed, everything is thrown into confusion, and their life is bereft of law, order and direction. For how will the angels say, 'Glory to God in the highest' [Lk 2:14] unless the Spirit enables them [to do so]? 'For no one can say Jesus is Lord, except in the Holy Spirit, and no one speaking by the Spirit of God says Jesus is anathema' [1 Cor 12:3].¹²² These words might be uttered by the evil and hostile spirits, whose fall confirms our statement that the invisible powers have free will, for they are equally balanced between virtue and vice, and for this reason need the Spirit's aid.

The citation of 1 Cor 12:3 in its entirety in this passage enables Basil to dovetail two themes, that of the confession of Christ's true identity and that of the angels' free will in relation to their sanctification. With regard to the former, 1 Cor 12:3 applies to both baptismal candidates (*Spir.* 11.27) and angels: their acknowledgment of Christ's lordship is possible only because of the presence of the Spirit.¹²³ Heising¹²⁴ points out that

¹¹⁹ On the transference of anthropocentric statements to the angels, see pp. 128-129.

¹²⁰ Cf. *Eun.* 3.2 (PG 29.660A-C); *hom.* 15.3 (PG 31.469B); *ep.* 159.2 (II, 87.21-26; PG 32.621A-B). See also Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation*, p. 20.

¹²¹ *Spir.* 16.38 (p. 81.9-23; PG 32.137A-C).

¹²² In this citation of 1 Cor 12:3, Basil has ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, where it should read ἀνάνθεμα Ἰησοῦν. Basil's variant reading occurs again in another citation of this part of the verse in *moral.* 28 (PG 31.748B). Basil also reverses the two clauses of 1 Cor 12:3. Could this reversal be due to a desire to provide a smoother transition to the discussion of the fallen angels and the reason behind their fall?

¹²³ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 146, 150. Daniélou ("Chrismation", p. 194) holds that Basil cites 1 Cor 12:3 in this passage in order to emphasize the fact that the Spirit is necessary for every creature to know the Trinity. He thus understands the use of 1 Cor 12:3 in *Spir.* 16.38 as a generalization of the argument of *Spir.* 18.47, where 1 Cor 12:3 is once again cited. There, this Pauline text is employed to demonstrate the necessity of the Spirit for men to

Basil's transference of anthropocentric statements here is facilitated by two factors. The first is Basil's concept of the ascetic lifestyle as one which is determined by the aspiration to live the "angelic life".¹²⁵ The second is Basil's knowledge of Origen's cosmogony in which human beings and angels are understood to share a common origin as rational, spiritual beings. However, with regard to the second theme in this passage, namely that of the angels' exercise of their free will in relation to their sanctification, Basil fails to provide a satisfactory answer to the question of whether the angels, like human beings, are able to renounce their acknowledgment of Christ's lordship and fall away from God.

This is a question with which Basil had wrestled at least since his composition of *Eun.* 1-3.¹²⁶ Here, in *Spir.* 16.38, Basil initiates his discussion of this question with the statement that the angels never abandon God, who is true goodness, but their free will is not thereby impaired. Further explanation for their assiduous adherence to God is

acquire true knowledge of the Son, and by implication, true knowledge of the Father (see pp. 129-130). Although Basil certainly believes that the Spirit is necessary for the angels to gain true knowledge of the Son and the Father, there is no reference to this point in the immediate context of the citation of 1 Cor 12:3 in *Spir.* 16.38.

¹²⁴ "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 281-283, 288, 290, 294.

¹²⁵ On Basil's conception of the human imitation of the angelic life, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 149-150; Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 280-300, *passim*; Piero Scazzoso, *Introduzione alla ecclesiologia di san Basilio* (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia, vol. 4; Milan; Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1975), pp. 305-307.

¹²⁶ Karl Berther ["Der Mensch und seine Verwirklichung in den Homilien des Basilius von Casarea. Ein anthropologisch-ethischer Versuch" (Unpublished theological dissertation, Freiburg, 1974), p. 46] notes that Basil's wrestling with the problem of evil stretches as far back as the composition of *philoc.* However, with regard to the question of the possibility of the angels' participation in evil, the earliest relevant statement is in *Eun.* 3.2 (PG 29.660B-C). According to this text, the angels' love for God is the presupposition of their sanctification. This statement implies that their holiness is not an intrinsic attribute, but an extrinsic one. Consequently, their nature is one which is subject to change, as the fall of Lucifer shows. See also the discussion by Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 283-290. Later, in *hom. in Ps. 44.1* (PG 29.388C), given at some point between 368 and 375 (Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 28-29), Basil states that angels do not change, but remain in the state in which they were originally created, with "their constitution being preserved pure and immutable". But Basil's most detailed discussion of this question prior to *Spir.* is found in *hom. in Ps. 32.4* (PG 29.333B,C-D), given ca. 375. Basil writes: "Every heavenly power has been established by the Spirit; that is, by the Spirit's aid, they have perseverance, firmness and steadfastness in holiness and in every virtue which is proper to the holy powers. ...So the creative Word, maker of the universe, gave existence to the angels and the Holy Spirit contributed sanctification to them. For the angels were not created infants, then perfected by gradual exercise, and so became worthy to receive the Spirit. Rather, in their initial formation and in the mixture, as it were, of their substance they had holiness laid as a foundation. Consequently, they are turned towards evil with difficulty, since they were immediately steered by their sanctification, [just as red-hot iron is hardened] by being dipped [into water], and possessed steadfastness in virtue through the gift of the Holy Spirit." It can be seen that the position of *Spir.* 16.38 on the question of the angels' participation in evil represents a conflation of the positions expressed in *Eun.* 3.2 and *hom. in Ps. 32.4*. See Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", p. 299.

offered at the end of *Spir.* 16.38 and in *Spir.* 19.49.¹²⁷ The Spirit, according to Basil's understanding of Ps 33:6, establishes the heavenly powers so that they are enabled to remain in blissful communion with God from the moment of their creation and never incline towards evil. Yet, Basil does not want to be regarded as a proponent of determinism,¹²⁸ and thus he adds in *Spir.* 16.38 that, despite this innate inclination to adhere to God, the angels do retain their free will. Evidence for this latter point is the existence of the wicked and hostile spirits, from whom one might expect the acclamation "Jesus is anathema" (1 Cor 12:3). For these spirits were in fact once angels, who exercised their free will to turn away from God,¹²⁹ and so lost the sanctifying presence of the Spirit. The existence of these demonic spirits leads Basil to conclude that the angels also must be in a state of equipoise between virtue and vice, and so in constant need of the Spirit's aid.

However, as Brooks Otis notes,¹³⁰ this account is not wholly consistent. If the angels, from the moment of their creation, have received from the Spirit the ability to adhere faithfully to God, why do they need the constant aid of the Spirit to prevent them from falling away? Explanations for Basil's failure to provide a satisfactory answer to this question have been sought, on the one hand, in his rejection of Origen's conception of evil,¹³¹ and, on the other, in the silence of the Christian tradition, including the New Testament, upon this subject.¹³² Be this situation as it may, Basil's exposition of 1 Cor 12:3 in *Spir.* 16.38 is sufficient to establish the point which he wants to drive home to the opposition: without the creative work and continued presence of the Holy Spirit the angelic hosts would be unable to confess Christ as Lord. Failure to give an adequate solution to the question of the angelic fall does not diminish the validity of this point.

1 Cor 12:3 appears yet a third time in *Spir.* In *Spir.* 18.47 Basil uses it to demonstrate the necessity of the Spirit for any knowledge of the Son,

¹²⁷ *Spir.* 16.38 (p. 82.23-27; PG 32.140B); 19.49 (pp. 98.20-99.1; PG 32.157A).

¹²⁸ Cf. N.P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin* (London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1938), p. 268.

¹²⁹ Cf. *Spir.* 20.51 (p. 103.17-21; PG 32.161C). See also Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation*, pp. 29-30; Maria Barbara von Stritzky, "Das Theodizeeproblem in der Sicht des Basilios von Caesarea" in Sencer Şahin, Elmar Schwertheim and Jörg Wagner, eds., *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Friedrich Karl Dörner* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978), II, 880.

¹³⁰ "Cappadocian Thought as a Coherent System", *DOP*, XII (1958), 109-114. Cf. Dörries' comments, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 184-185. Pace Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation*, p. 22, n.2.

¹³¹ Otis, "Cappadocian Thought", pp. 110-111.

¹³² A.J. Philippou, "The Doctrine of Evil in St. Gregory of Nyssa", *SP*, IX (1966), 254.

and by implication, for any knowledge of the Father.¹³³ The Cappadocian bishop writes:¹³⁴

When, by means of the illuminating power, we fix our eyes on the beauty of the invisible image and through that image are led up to the supremely beautiful spectacle of the Archetype, the Spirit of knowledge is inseparably present there with [the Father and Son]. To those who love the vision of the truth the Spirit supplies in himself (ἐν ἑαυτῷ) the power to behold the image. He does not give the revelation from without, but in himself leads to the knowledge [of the image]. For just as ‘no one knows the Father except the Son’ [Mt 11:27], so ‘no one can say Jesus is Lord except in the Holy Spirit’ [1 Cor 12:3]. For it does not say ‘through the Spirit’ (διὰ πνεύματος), but ‘in the Spirit’ (ἐν πνεύματι). Moreover, ‘God is a Spirit, and his worshippers must worship him in spirit and truth’ [Jn 4:24]. And, as it is written, ‘In your light we shall see light’ [Ps 36:9], that is, in the illumination of the Spirit [we shall see] ‘the true light that enlightens every man that comes into the world’ [Jn 1:9]. Thus, in himself he makes known the glory of the Only-Begotten, and in himself provides the knowledge of God to the true worshippers. Therefore, the way of the knowledge of God is from the one Spirit through the one Son to the one Father.

Basil’s interest in 1 Cor 12:3 in this text is focused upon the preposition “in” (ἐν).¹³⁵ For Basil, this preposition indicates that it is only the Spirit’s

¹³³ Daniélou, “Chrismation”, p. 194.

¹³⁴ Pp. 94.17-95.22; PG 32.153A-B. Basil’s use of 1 Cor 12:3 in this passage may be influenced by the use of the same verse in a statement composed in 359 by George of Laodicea, a leading figure in the Homoiousian party. According to Epiphanius [*haer.* 73.16.5-6 (p.289.8-14; PG 42.433B-C)], the relevant section of this statement ran as follows: “The Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, teaches us the truth, which is the Son. For ‘no one says Jesus is Lord, except in the Holy Spirit’ [1 Cor 12:3]. Similarly also the Son, who is the truth, teaches us to know reverently the true God, his Father, just as he says, ‘The one who has seen me has seen the Father’ [Jn 14:9]. Accordingly, we rightly perceive the Son in the Holy Spirit, and we glorify, both reverently and rightly, the Father in the only-begotten Son.” Both this text and that from Basil emphasize the fact that it is only in the Holy Spirit that true knowledge of the Son is obtained. Basil, who had connections with the Homoiousian party through Eustathius of Sebaste (Kopecek, *Neo-Arianism*, II, 361-364), was probably familiar with this statement (Dehnhard, *Problem*, p. 76).

¹³⁵ Basil had already discussed in *Spir.* 2-8 the dogmatic significance of the prepositions which are used by Scripture with regard to the members of the Godhead. This discussion was a response to the reasoning of Aëtius, the leader of the Anomoeans, concerning the nature of the triune God. For Aëtius, the fact that Scripture (chiefly 1 Cor 8:6) uses different prepositions with regard to the Father, Son and Spirit is an indication that the three differ in nature. From this thesis he drew up the following schema: ἐκ, used of the Father, refers to his unoriginated nature as Creator; διὰ, used of the Son, indicates that he is the instrument of the Father and thus subordinate to him; ἐν, used of the Spirit, shows that he represents merely the circumstances (that is, place and time) which accompany the actions of the Father [*Spir.* 2.4 (pp. 18.11-20.6; PG 32.73A-C); see also Heinrich Dörrie, “Präpositionen und Metaphysik. Wechselwirkungen zweier Prinzipreihen”, *MH*, XXIV (1969), 225-227].

In order to refute this thesis Basil undertakes a brief examination of the actual way in which Scripture does use these prepositions. His examination shows that the Scriptures do not at all conform to Aëtius’ rule. For instance, in 1 Cor 1:9 διὰ is used of the Father, and in 1 Cor 2:10 and 12:8 it is used with regard to the Spirit [*Spir.* 5.10 (p. 28.9-12, 17-21; PG 32.84B,C)]. If Scripture employs these prepositions indifferently with regard to the Father,

personal presence which enables the believer to gaze steadfastly upon the invisible image of God, and so receive true knowledge of the Son. If this knowledge were simply imparted through the Spirit as through an intermediary, the preposition “through” (διὰ) would have been used.¹³⁶ But in this case, even the angels could be employed as mediators of the knowledge of God. As it is, since the Son is God, true knowledge of him can be given only through revelation by God himself.¹³⁷ The preposition “in”, which indicates the personal presence of the Spirit in this revelation, thus implies his divinity. Yet, as Yamamura rightly points out,¹³⁸ the question here is larger than simply that of the divinity of the Spirit. The problem of how Jesus Christ is recognized as God is also at stake.

It is Basil’s image theology that provides the means by which the implications of the preposition “in” are firmly anchored to a solution to the problem of how Christ is known as God. Basil’s youthful work against Eunomius testifies to his early fondness for this use of image theology. Alluding to Heb 1:3 and Col 1:15 in *Eun.* 1.17, Basil states that it is through the image (the Son) that knowledge of the archetype (the Father) is gained.¹³⁹ Moreover, the Son is the image of the Father’s being and thus a community of nature between the Father and the Son is implied.¹⁴⁰ In *Spir.* 26.64 the indispensable conclusion to this teaching is presented:¹⁴¹

Just as the Father is seen in the Son, so the Son is seen in the Spirit (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι).... Now, it is impossible to see the invisible image of God, except in the illumination of the Spirit. And it is impossible for the one who contemplates the image to separate the light from the image, for the cause of the vision is necessarily perceived together with what is seen. Therefore, the fit conclusion is that through the illumination of the Spirit we behold the radiance of God’s glory.

Just as the image of God is inseparable from its archetype, so the light, that is the Spirit, in which that image is revealed cannot be severed from

Son, and Spirit, this actually indicates that their being is one [*Spir.* 5.8 (pp. 26.15-27.6; *PG* 32.81A-C); 5.11 (p. 29.13-16; *PG* 32.85A)]! See also Pelikan, “Spiritual Sense”, pp. 348-353.

¹³⁶ Daniélou, “Chrismation”, p. 194. Cf. also Dehnhard’s observations about Basil’s use of active verbs in this passage, *Problem*, p. 77.

¹³⁷ Daniélou, “Chrismation”, p. 198; J. [J.] Verhees, “Pneuma, Erfahrung und Erleuchtung in der Theologie des Basilios des Grossen”, *OS*, XXV (1976), 49.

¹³⁸ “Development”, pp. 14-15.

¹³⁹ *PG* 29.552B. See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 145.

¹⁴⁰ See Barmann, “Cappadocian Triumph”, p. 84. For a complete discussion of this theme, see Maximos Aghiorgoussis, “Image as ‘Sign’ (Semeion) of God: Knowledge of God through the Image according to Saint Basil”, *GOTR*, XXI (1976), 19-54.

¹⁴¹ P. 123.10-11, 25-30; *PG* 32.185A,B-C. Cf. *Spir.* 9.23 (p. 53.5-12; *PG* 32.109B). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 145.

that which it reveals. A comparison between *Spir.* 18.47 and this passage shows how this line of reasoning shapes the exposition of 1 Cor 12:3 there. From this Pauline text it is concluded that the knowledge of the Son, the invisible image, is given in the illumination of the Spirit. On the basis of *Spir.* 26.64 this conclusion implies that the Spirit and the Son are inseparable, for the light cannot be separated from what it reveals.¹⁴²

Moreover these conclusions which Basil draws from 1 Cor 12:3 are essential to the answer which the bishop of Caesarea gives to the more general question of how God is known. From the illumination given by the Spirit, the believer is led up through the contemplation of the Son to the vision of the archetype, that is, the Father.¹⁴³ This order of the divine persons corresponds to the way in which God reveals himself to men and women, and consequently does not constitute a reversal of the divine order given in the baptismal command.¹⁴⁴ However, as an order of revelation it cannot be understood too strictly. Since the light is perceived at the same time as what it reveals, the Spirit and the Son are known simultaneously. Hence, Basil's concept of the way to the knowledge of God cannot be reduced merely to a conclusion which has been drawn from the Spirit's work in his own life.¹⁴⁵ Rather, it is based upon Basil's understanding of the relationships which hold between the persons of the Godhead.¹⁴⁶

To recapitulate: Basil's exposition of 1 Cor 12:3 in *Spir.* 11:27 serves to indicate that the acknowledgment of Christ's true nature by baptismal candidates is possible only when the Spirit is present to inspire the confession. Basil's concept of the ascetic as one who is striving to live

¹⁴² Cf. Dehnhard, *Problem*, p. 77; Torrance, "Spiritus Creator", pp. 223-224.

¹⁴³ Cf. *Fid.4* (PG 31.685C); *Spir.* 9.23 (p.53.9-12; PG 32.109B); 26.64 (pp. 123.25-124.2; PG 32.185C); *ep.* 226.3 (III, 27.34-36; PG 32.849A): "For our mind, enlightened by the Spirit, looks up to the Son and in him, as in an image, contemplates the Father." For further discussion, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 144-146, 152-153, 161-162; Špidlík, *Sophiologie*, pp. 198-200; Greer, *Captain*, pp. 97-99. For a discussion of possible sources for Basil's image theology, see Dehnhard, *Problem*, pp. 43-46. For Gregory of Nyssa's use of this aspect of Basil's thought, see Gerhard May, "Einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis Gregors von Nyssa zu Basilios dem Grossen" in Fontaine and Kannengiesser, eds., *EPEKTASIS*, pp. 512-514.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. pp. 150-151.

¹⁴⁵ Torrance, "Spiritus Creator", p. 224. Nevertheless, the powerful influence which Basil's ascetic experience exerted upon his trinitarian theology ought not to be forgotten. For Basil, only the one who is free from carnal desire can receive the Spirit and so engage in the contemplation of the Son and the Father. See *Spir.* 9.23 (p.53.1-12; PG 32.109A-B). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 152-153, 159-162; Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, pp. 285-287; Bilaniuk, "Pneumatophor", pp. 54-56; Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", p. 357.

¹⁴⁶ McIntyre, "Holy Spirit", p. 366; Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", p. 344: "to Basil the relation between the divine persons in revelation was also (and first) their relation in being: epistemology within the 'economy' recapitulated ontology within the 'theology'."

the “angelic life” and his use of Origen’s cosmogony facilitate the transfer, apropos of 1 Cor 12:3, of this anthropocentric statement to the angels in *Spir.* 16.38: the angels also require the Spirit’s presence to acknowledge Jesus’ lordship. The anathema-clause of 1 Cor 12:3 confirms Basil’s view that the angels retain their free will. Although his ensuing explanation of the angelic fall is far from satisfactory, his use of 1 Cor 12:3 in this regard does reveal his firm belief that the major cause for the angelic fall lay in the exercise of their free will. On the other hand, Basil’s exposition of 1 Cor 12:3 in *Spir.* 18.47 is shaped essentially by his image theology. Here, the limelight is given to the preposition “in”, which, as Basil explains in terms of his image theology, implies the Spirit’s inseparability from the Son. The Spirit’s role is to complete the work of revelation which originates with the Father and is conveyed through the Son. He does so, not by pointing to one outside of himself, but by unveiling the glory of the Son within himself.¹⁴⁷ Certain knowledge of the Son is thus made possible, and with this knowledge, the blessed vision of the Father also is given. The indispensable role that the Spirit plays in the process of knowing Christ forms the bond which unites these two expositions of 1 Cor 12:3. The initial confession of Christ’s true nature, by both human beings and angels (*Spir.* 11.27; 16.38), and the growth in knowledge about the subject of that confession (*Spir.* 18.47) are made possible only by the presence of the Spirit. For Basil, the Spirit is the place of revelation of the Son.¹⁴⁸ Hence, despite Basil’s great concern to demonstrate that the Spirit is an individual, substantial member of the Godhead, he never loses sight of the Spirit’s intimate relationship to the Son, and also to the Father.¹⁴⁹

4. The Spirit in Baptism

The lofty estimation of baptism contained in Basil’s personal testimony in *Spir.* 10.26¹⁵⁰ corroborates Dörries’ statement that for Basil baptism was the basic religious experience and the immovable foundation of trinitarian theology.¹⁵¹ However, this foundation is not based solely upon

¹⁴⁷ McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, p. 366.

¹⁴⁸ See pp. 126-127.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Torrance, “Spiritus Creator”, p. 213.

¹⁵⁰ See pp. 120-121.

¹⁵¹ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 133-134, 151, 180; *idem*, *Die Theologie des Makarios/Symeon* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, no. 103; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), pp. 440-441. Cf. the comments of Hanson, “Dogma and Formula”, p. 182. On the relationship between baptism and trinitarian theology, see *epp.* 226.3 (III, 27.28-34; PG 32.848C-849A); 105 (II, 7.24-25, 27-30; PG 32.513A-B).

experience. Basil's initial reply to Eustathius in *Spir.* 10.24 demonstrates that this foundation receives objectivity from its origin in the baptismal command given by Christ in Mt 28:19.¹⁵² Consequently, this word of revelation concerning baptism is binding upon all Christians, and thus baptism is necessary for salvation.¹⁵³ Yet, it is saving only if it is administered according to the dominical formula handed down from the Apostles, that is, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.¹⁵⁴ When Scripture records instances of baptism into only the Spirit, as for example in 1 Cor 12:13, then the other two members of the Trinity are to be understood.¹⁵⁵ This reasoning leads Basil to conclude:¹⁵⁶

Therefore, if in baptism the separation of the Spirit from the Father and Son is dangerous for the one who baptizes and useless for the one who receives it, how safe is it for us to separate the Spirit from the Father and Son? For faith and baptism are two ways of salvation which are indivisibly united to one another. For faith is perfected by baptism, and baptism is confirmed by faith, and both are fulfilled by the same names. For as we believe in the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, so we are baptized also in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. First of all comes the confession [of faith], which introduces us to salvation, and then follows baptism, which confirms our assent.

If the separation of the Spirit from the Father and the Son in the baptismal formula renders baptism ineffective, then surely, reasons the bishop of Caesarea, the same holds true for the confession of faith. Refusal to confess the Spirit's deity along with that of the Father and the Son renders faith in the Father and the Son null and void.

Nevertheless, Eustathius, who had a different understanding of baptism,¹⁵⁷ objected to this reasoning on the basis of a number of Scriptural

¹⁵² See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 133-134; *idem*, "Basilius", p. 132.

¹⁵³ *Eun.* 3.5 (*PG* 29.665C); *Spir.* 12.28 (pp.64.11-655; *PG* 32.117B-C). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 58; Špidlík, *Sophiologie*, p. 204; Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation*, pp. 112-113.

¹⁵⁴ *Spir.* 12.28 (pp. 64.5-65.3; *PG* 32.117A-C). See Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation*, pp. 115-116.

¹⁵⁵ *Spir.* 12.28 (pp. 63.20-64.4; *PG* 32.117A). Basil's understanding of 1 Cor 12:13 at this point is conditioned by his belief that Mt 28:19 contains the baptismal formula normative for the early Church. This is reflected in Basil's incorrect rendering of the verse from 1 Cor. Paul had written: "For we were all baptized by one Spirit into one body". Basil renders it: "For we were all baptized in one body into one Spirit". See also *Spir.* 26.61 (p. 120-4.5; *PG* 32.181B-C).

¹⁵⁶ *Spir.* 12.28 (pp. 64.11-65.3; *PG* 32.117B-C).

¹⁵⁷ According to Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", pp. 54-55) the Spirit did not have a central role in Eustathius' baptismal theology. The fact that the Church baptized its members into the Holy Spirit had no theological significance for him. Cf. Gribomont, "Eustathe de Sébaste", col. 1711; Elena Cavalcanti, "Theognosia per mezzo dello Spirito e inconoscibilità dello Spirito nel *De Spiritu Sancto* di Basilio de Cesarea", *Aug.* XIX (1979), 406-407.

¹⁵⁸ *Spir.* 13.29 (p. 65.7-13; *PG* 32.117C); 14.31 (p.68.5-13; *PG* 32.121B).

texts: 1 Tim 5:21, 1 Cor 10:2, and Ex 14:31.¹⁵⁸ Fundamental to his use of these texts is the belief that the juxtaposition of the three names in the baptismal formula does not imply that the three share the same nature or are co-equal in dignity. Basil cites Eustathius' objection apropos of 1 Cor 10:2 in *Spir.* 14.31:¹⁵⁹

But, it is urged, even if we are baptized into the Spirit, it is not therefore proper to rank [the Spirit] with God, for 'they were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea' [1 Cor 10:2]. In a similar fashion it is acknowledged that before now faith has been placed in men: 'for the people believed in God and Moses his servant' [Ex 14:31]. Therefore, it is asked, why do you exalt and magnify the Holy Spirit so far above creation, on the basis of faith and baptism, when the same have before now also been testified of men?

The fact that, according to 1 Cor 10:2, people have been baptized into Moses, and into the cloud and the sea is plain proof that the inclusion of the Holy Spirit in the baptismal formula says nothing about his nature and status. Just as it would be absurd to reason from 1 Cor 10:2 that Moses was above the status of a creature, so it is foolish to contend for the Spirit's divinity on the basis of Mt 28:19.

Basil's answer to this new objection is a typological exegesis of this verse from 1 Cor. His introduction to this interpretation of 1 Cor. 10:2 reflects the view generally held by the Fathers that a proper understanding of the events of the Old Testament cannot be divorced from the recognition of the typological structure of those events. As Basil writes:¹⁶⁰

Divine realities are frequently signified beforehand by the shadowy outline of types. But I do not regard the nature of these divine realities as insignificant because they are prefigured by insignificant human [types]. For the type is an exhibition of what is expected and gives in advance, by means of imitation, an indication of the future.

Then, in a passage based upon Origen,¹⁶¹ Basil proceeds to cite some of the types which can be found in the Scriptures.¹⁶² There are, for example, numerous types in the history of Israel's exodus from Egypt. The preservation of the first-born of the Israelites is a typological indication that all of those who are made alive in Christ no longer die in Adam (1 Cor 15:22). Another example is found in 1 Cor 10:4, wherein the rock from which Moses produced water in the wilderness is understood as a type of Christ.

¹⁵⁹ P.68.5-13; PG 32.121B. See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 59, 81-82.

¹⁶⁰ *Spir.* 14.31 (pp. 68.16-69.5; PG 32.121B-C).

¹⁶¹ See Gribomont, "Origénisme", p. 290; Amand de Mendieta, *APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS*, pp. 67-68.

¹⁶² *Spir.* 14.31 (pp. 69.5-70.1; PG 32.121C-124B).

Basil is now prepared to undertake a typological exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2. He begins with the phrase "in the cloud and in the sea".¹⁶³

At the time [of Israel's exodus], the sea and the cloud led on through amazement to faith, but for the future [they were] a type which prefigured the grace to come. 'Who is wise and will understand these matters?' [Hos 14:9 (LXX)]. How the sea is a type of baptism, since it effects a separation from Pharaoh, just as this washing [effects a separation] from the tyranny of the devil. For the sea killed the enemy in itself, and here [in baptism], our enmity towards God is put to death. The people emerged from the sea unscathed; we too come up from the water, as it were alive from the dead, saved by grace, the grace of him who called us [cf. Eph 2:5-6]. And the cloud is a shadow of the gift of the Spirit who cools the flame of our passions through the mortification of our members.

Basil's exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2 here is similar to that given in a powerful exhortatory passage from *hom.* 13.2:¹⁶⁴

Are you worshipping the one who died for you? If so, receive him by being buried together with him in baptism. If you are not united [with him] in the likeness of his death, how will you be a partaker of his resurrection? That [nation] Israel 'was baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea', imparting types for your [instruction] and symbolizing the truth which was to be revealed in the last times. Yet you are avoiding baptism. [And what you are avoiding is] not that which is typified in the sea, but that which is fulfilled in reality; not [that which is typified] in the cloud, but [that which is fulfilled] in the Holy Spirit; not [that which is typified] in Moses, our fellow-servant, but [that which is fulfilled] in Christ the Creator. If Israel had not passed through the sea, they would not have escaped from Pharaoh. And if you do not pass through the water, you will not escape from the bitter tyranny of the devil.

Although Basil's typological exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2 in these two passages draws upon the traditional interpretation of this verse in the Greek patristic tradition,¹⁶⁵ his exegesis is essentially guided by his belief that baptism is necessary for sanctification and salvation. The sea and the cloud typologically show forth the grace that was to be revealed only at the coming of Christ. The sea speaks of death: for the Israelites the death of their enemy, Pharaoh; for the Christians the death of their enmity towards God and freedom from the deadly tyranny of the devil.¹⁶⁶ The cloud, on the other hand, was a sign of God's presence among the

¹⁶³ *Spir.* 14.31 (p. 70.1-13; *PG* 32.124B).

¹⁶⁴ *PG* 31.423A-B. According to Bernardi (*Prédication*, pp. 68,74) this homily was given on January 6, 371.

¹⁶⁵ On the exposition of this verse among the Greek Fathers see F.J. Dolger, "Der Durchzug durch das Rote Meer als Sinnbild der christlichen Taufe" in his *Antike und Christentum* (1930 ed.; rpt. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974), II, 63-69; Jean Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), pp. 86-98.

¹⁶⁶ See also the Basilian texts assembled by Amougou-Atangana, *Sakrament*, p. 182.

Israelites and thus foreshadowed the gift of the Spirit, who is imparted to the believer in baptism.¹⁶⁷

It is noteworthy that Basil, in discussing the typological meaning of the sea and the cloud in both of these passages, reverses the order in which these types occur in 1 Cor 10:2. Lindsay Dewar¹⁶⁸ sees in this transposition convincing evidence that Basil did not associate the gift of the Spirit with water-baptism, but with an event which occurred subsequent to it. The event to which Dewar is probably referring is post-baptismal chrismation. While some of the Greek Fathers did interpret post-baptismal chrismation in terms of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit,¹⁶⁹ Basil never does so.¹⁷⁰ In fact, Georg Kretschmar¹⁷¹ and Jean Daniélou¹⁷² have shown that the initiatory rites of the church at Caesarea included only a pre-baptismal chrismation.¹⁷³ This chrismation preceded the confession of faith before baptism. If this is the case, what explanation is to be given for the order in which Basil discusses the types of 1 Cor 10:2? The answer to this question is found in Basil's treatment of baptism in the chapter immediately following that which contains his exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2. In *Spir.* 15.35, the bishop writes:¹⁷⁴

For a perfect life the imitation of Christ is necessary, not only with regard to the examples of freedom from anger, humility, and longsuffering [which he has left us] in his life, but also [with regard to those he has left us] in his death. As Paul, the imitator of Christ, says: 'becoming like him in his death, so that

¹⁶⁷ Cf. *hom. in Ps.* 28.8 (PG 29.3048-C). See also the conclusions of Lampe, *Seal*, pp. 197, 211; Ligier, *Confirmation*, p. 205.

¹⁶⁸ *The Holy Spirit and Modern Thought* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1959), p. 107.

¹⁶⁹ See Lampe, *Seal*, pp. 215-222; Mitchell, *Baptismal Anointing*, pp. 52-54; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (5th ed.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1977), pp. 432-435.

¹⁷⁰ Nor did Athanasius, although Athanasius' correspondent, Serapion, did ascribe the gift of the Spirit to this rite. See pp. 88-89, n. 174.

¹⁷¹ "Taufgottesdienstes", pp. 167-169.

¹⁷² "Chrismation", pp. 186-187.

¹⁷³ However, there is one text in the Basilian corpus which Lampe (*Seal*, p. 219) and Kelly (*Doctrines*, p. 434) have taken to indicate a post-baptismal chrismation. It occurs in *hom.* 1.2 (PG 31.165A) and makes the following comment apropos of Mt 6:17: "'Anoint your head and wash your face'. This verse summons you to the mysteries. The one who anointed himself has been anointed; the one who washed himself has been washed thoroughly. Wash your soul thoroughly from its sins. Anoint your head with a holy chrism in order that you might partake of Christ". Basil's discussion of these two aspects of the initiation rite does not necessarily indicate a postbaptismal chrismation. While Basil's exhortation at the end of the text does mention first baptism and then chrismation, in the previous sentence this order is reversed. As Kretschmar ("Taufgottesdienstes", p. 168, n. 77) points out, this text needs to be interpreted in the light of those passages which are more explicit with regard to the order of the various aspects of the initiatory rite at Caesarea.

¹⁷⁴ Pp. 73.23-74.18, 29-75.3, 8-12; PG 32.128C-129B, C-D.

I may perhaps attain to the resurrection of the dead' [Phil 3:10-11]. How then are we made in the likeness of his death? When we were buried with him in baptism. What then is the form of the burial? And what benefit [is gained] from such an imitation? First of all, it is necessary to terminate the ways of the old life. But this is impossible unless a man is born again, as the Lord has said [cf. Jn 3:3]. For regeneration, as even the name itself indicates, is the beginning of a second life. In order to begin a second life, it is necessary to put an end to the preceding one. Just as in the case of those running the double course there is a stop and pause which separates the opposite motions, so in the case of those who change their lives it seems necessary that death intervene between the two lives in order to put an end to that which precedes and to give a beginning to that which follows.

How then do we achieve the descent into hell? When we imitate the burial of Christ through baptism. For the bodies of those who are being baptized are, as it were, buried in the water. ...[So] the Lord, who gives us life, has entrusted to us the covenant of baptism, which contains a type of death and life: the water fulfills the image of death, and the Spirit gives the earnest of life. ... On the one hand, the water supplies the image of death when it receives the body like a tomb, and, on the other, the Spirit infuses life-giving power, when he restores our souls from a state of deadness, which was the result of sin, to the life [which they possessed] in the beginning.

Basil discerns two successive events in the act of baptism, both of which are grounded in the imitation of Christ. The believer is buried with Christ by being immersed in the water, which receives the body of the candidate like a tomb, and this action symbolizes the death of the old nature. This "burial" must precede the second event, in which the soul of the candidate is renewed by the Holy Spirit. The candidate rises from the water, freed from the deadness of sin and imbued with the new life that comes from the Risen Lord.¹⁷⁵ Given this conception of the order in which the two events of baptism must occur, it is readily understandable why Basil discusses first the sea, and then the cloud. The sea, the type of death, has to precede the cloud, the type of the life-giving Spirit.

In *Spir.* 14.32, Basil proceeds to investigate the meaning of the phrase "they were baptized into Moses". For the audience to which *hom.* 13 was preached it was sufficient for Basil to contrast the type, baptism into Moses, our fellow-servant, with its fulfillment, baptism into Christ, our Creator. In his answer to Eustathius, however, this basic thought has to be expanded. Consequently, Basil writes:¹⁷⁶

What then? Is the grace of baptism insignificant because they were typically baptized into Moses? Were this the case, none of our other benefits would be great if we were to disparage in advance what is holy in each of them [by

¹⁷⁵ See also Špidlík, *Sophiologie*, pp. 205-209; Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation*, pp. 114, 118-119.

¹⁷⁶ Pp. 70.14-71.11; PG 32.124C-125A.

comparing them] with their types. For then God's love for men, although he gave his only-begotten Son for the sake of our sins, would not be anything great or extraordinary, since Abraham also did not spare his own son. Nor would the passion of our Lord be glorious, since a sheep, instead of Isaac, typified the sacrifice. Nor would the descent into hell be fearful, since Jonah had already typified the death in three days and nights [in the belly of the fish]. The same [prejudicial comparison] is made in the case of baptism by the one who compares the truth with its shadow, who compares the types with what they signify, and who attempts, by means of Moses and the sea, to disparage at once the entire dispensation of the gospel. For what forgiveness of transgressions or renewal of life is there in the sea? What spiritual gift is given through Moses? What mortification is there in this type? Those people did not suffer with Christ, which is why they were not raised with him. They did not bear 'the image of the heavenly' [1 Cor 15:49]; they did not carry about 'in their body the death of the Lord Jesus' [2 Cor 4:10]; they did not put off the old man; they did not put on the new man, 'which is being renewed in knowledge in the image of its Creator' [Col 3:9,10]. Why then do you compare these baptisms, which have only the name in common and which have so great a difference between them, as there might be between a dream and the truth, a shadow or images and substantial reality?

Regarding as equivalent the baptism into Moses and the baptism into the Trinity constitutes a failure to understand the typological structure of the Scriptures. The baptism into Moses is only the type, that is, the foreshadowing of the greater event, Christian baptism. Consequently, there is not an exact one to one correspondence between the two: the Israelites who crossed the Red Sea under the leadership of Moses did not experience the death of the old nature nor did they receive the gift of the new life in Christ. Only one conclusion is possible:¹⁷⁷

Therefore, even if someone was baptized into Moses, the grace which comes from the Spirit in baptism is not insignificant.

This statement initiates a new train of thought, which provides another way by which the phrase "they were baptized into Moses" can be understood. Basil writes:¹⁷⁸

Indeed, I have to point out that in Scripture it is customary to speak of Moses and the law, as in the verse, 'They have Moses and the prophets' [Lk 16:29]. Therefore, when [Scripture wants] to speak of the baptism of the law,¹⁷⁹ it says 'they were baptized into Moses' [1 Cor 10:2]....For in accordance with the progressive method of [God's] teaching, when we were proceeding towards perfection in the exercise of piety we were first instructed in the basic principles which were easier to apprehend and which were commensurate

¹⁷⁷ *Spir.* 14.33 (pp. 71.28-72.2; *PG* 32.125C).

¹⁷⁸ *Spir.* 14.33 (pp. 72.2-28; *PG* 32.125C-128B).

¹⁷⁹ By the phrase "baptism of the law" Basil apparently means initiation into the system governed by the Mosaic law. Consequently, it is envisaged as a rough equivalent of Christian initiation. See Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, p. 362, n. 1.

with our intelligence. Then, the one who distributes his gifts to us leads us up by gradual accommodation, like eyes which have been accustomed to darkness, to the great light of the truth. For he spares our weaknesses; in the depth of the riches of his wisdom and of the unsearchable judgments of his understanding he provides this gentle direction which is well-suited to our [frame]. First of all, he accustoms [us] to see the shadows of objects and to look at the sun in the water, lest we be blinded by immediately encountering the spectacle of pure light. In the same manner, the law, 'which contains a shadow of things to come' [Heb 10:1], and the prefiguration given through the prophets, which is a type of the truth, have been conceived as a school for the eyes of the heart. In this way, the transition from these shadows to 'that wisdom which has been hidden in a mystery' [1 Cor 2:7] will be easy for us.

This exposition serves to buttress the conclusion which Basil has already reached: baptism into Moses is merely a type of Christian baptism, and, as such, lacks the richness of its fulfillment. From Lk 16:29 Basil derives the equation "Moses equals the law". Therefore, the phrase "baptism into Moses" can be re-cast in the form "baptism of the law". Seen in this light, the objection of Eustathius reveals his failure to comprehend the way in which God has dealt with humanity in history. God's dealings with humanity can be compared to a process of gradual acclimatization, in which eyes that have known only darkness grow accustomed to the full intensity of sunlight. At first the eyes must focus on shadows and reflections, so that they do not become blinded by a premature glance at the sun. Analogous to this stage are the epochs covered by the law and the prophets, when the elementary principles of religion are taught. But finally the time arrives when the eyes no longer need to focus solely on shadows, but can look upon "the pure light" itself. In a similar fashion, the shadows of the law and the prophets eventually give way to the light of the truth, that "wisdom which has been hidden in a mystery" (1 Cor 2:7).

Basil's exposition of 1 Cor 10:2 arose out of the necessity of correcting the erroneous conclusions which Eustathius drew from the text. Although Basil's conception of typology is a key factor in this reply to Eustathius, it provides only the form by which his Pneumatomachian opponent is answered. It is Basil's view of the incomparable benefits given by the "real presence" of the Spirit in the waters of baptism which shapes the content of that answer.¹⁸⁰ Confirmation of the decisive role which Basil's baptismal theology plays in his exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2 is given by his discussion of "the sea" and "the cloud". The order in which he discusses these two types is a transposition of the order in which they

¹⁸⁰ For a list of some of these benefits, see *Spir.* 15.36 (p. 76.6-14; *PG* 32.132B).

actually occur in the text of 1 Cor 10:2. This transposition corresponds to Basil's understanding of what transpires in baptism. The old nature dies in the water (typified by "the sea") and the new man rises from the water imbued with the Spirit (foreshadowed by "the cloud").

5. *The Spirit of God*

The greatest irrefutable proof of the unity which exists between the Spirit, on the one hand, and the Father and Son, on the other, is, according to Basil, 1 Cor 2:11. The Holy Spirit has the same relationship to God as the human spirit has to each human being, one of intimate and inseparable communion.¹⁸¹ Despite this affirmation, the text possesses little significance for Basil's arguments against Eustathius. Yet previously, in Basil's reply to the Anomoean Eunomius, the text had received wider exposure. *Eun.* 1-3 was written *ca.* 363-365¹⁸² in order to demonstrate, on the one hand, the absurdity of Eunomius' theology and, on the other, the soundness of the Nicene faith.¹⁸³ For Eunomius the being of God is nothing other than "ingeneracy" (ἀγεννησία). "Ingeneracy" is not merely one property of God among others but the definition and name of his being. Furthermore, according to Eunomius' epistemology, knowledge of the name which divine providence has established for every being, including God, is at the same time perfect knowledge of that being. Thus to know God's name is to know his being.¹⁸⁴ Basil, in his refutation of Eunomius, seeks to show that the being of God the Father is unknowable to all but the Son and the Spirit. As Basil writes in *Eun.* 1.13-14:¹⁸⁵

He [Eunomius] does not admit that the being of God itself is beyond all understanding and human knowledge. But I think that the comprehension of it exceeds not only men, but also every rational nature. Here I am speaking of that rational [nature] which is created. For the Father is known by the only Son and by the Holy Spirit. For 'no one knows the Father except the Son' [Mt

¹⁸¹ *Spir.* 16.40 (pp. 85.21-86.3 ; *PG* 32.144A).

¹⁸² Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 8, n. 1; Quasten, *Patrology*, III, 209; Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", p. 453, n.1 Kopecek (*Neo-Arianism*, II, 364-372) places the composition and publication of *Eun.* 1-3 in 360 or early 361.

¹⁸³ Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", p. 67.

¹⁸⁴ Abramowski, "Eunomios", col. 946; Meredith, "Orthodoxy", pp. 13, 19-20.

¹⁸⁵ *PG* 29.544A-B. For a discussion of this passage, see Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", pp. 81-82. See also Elena Cavalcanti, *Studi Eunomiani* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta, no. 202; Rome: Pontificum Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1976), p. 41; Edmund Beck, *Ephrāms des Syrsers Psychologie und Erkenntnislehre* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, vol. 419; Louvain: Secretariat du Corpus SCO, 1980), pp. 119-122, 155.

11:27]. And the Spirit ‘searches all things, even the depths of God’. For it says that no one knows ‘the thoughts of a man except the spirit of the man which is within him; and no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit who is from God’ [1 Cor 2:10-11].¹⁸⁶

Mt 11:27 provides clear evidence that the knowledge of the Father’s being is known only to the Son. But Basil does not wish to exclude the Spirit from knowledge of the Father’s being, and so he cites 1 Cor 2:10-11.¹⁸⁷ This text occurs again in *Eun.* 3.4, where Basil is arguing for the Spirit’s divinity on the basis of the fact that he shares the same activities with the Father and the Son. One of these activities is the intimate sharing of divine knowledge. Basil writes:¹⁸⁸

[The Scripture] says that, just as no one ‘knows the thoughts of a man except the spirit of the man which is within him, so also no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God’ [1 Cor 2:11]. For, just as nothing which is alien or foreign is able to contemplate the thoughts within the soul, so it is clear also that if something partakes of the ineffable thoughts of God, it is neither alien nor foreign to him, [but] is able to examine the depths of God’s judgments.

The thoughts of the human soul are inaccessible to scrutiny from without. Similarly the fact that the ineffable thoughts of God are shared with the Spirit must mean that he is not outside of God. A final reference to this Pauline text is found in *Eun.* 3.6. Eunomius asserted that the Spirit is a creature since he is neither unbegotten, as the Father, nor begotten, as the Son. Basil insists that the believer must confess with boldness his ignorance about the Spirit, and yet hold fast to the fact that he is exalted above the created realm, as the Scriptures state. What then is he to be called? Basil answers:¹⁸⁹

Holy Spirit and Spirit of God, Spirit of truth, who is sent from God and bestowed through the Son. He is not a servant, but holy, good and sovereign. [He is the] life-giving Spirit, Spirit of adoption, who knows all [the thoughts] of God. Thus, the doctrine of the unity is preserved in the Trinity, when confession of one Father and one Son and one Spirit is made.

Common to all of these passages is the fact that the Spirit’s possession of knowledge which is inaccessible to the created mind distinguishes him from the created realm. One passage in particular, that from *Eun.* 3.4, draws out the implications of this distinction apropos of 1 Cor 2:11

¹⁸⁶ Basil has “the Spirit who is from God” (from 1 Cor 2:12) instead of “the Spirit of God”.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. *ep.* 236.1 (III, 48.25-31; *PG* 32.877A), where Basil gives the orthodox interpretation of Mt 11:27.

¹⁸⁸ *PG* 29.664C.

¹⁸⁹ *PG* 29.668C-D. See also Heising, “Der Heilige Geist”, p. 286.

in great detail. The Spirit's participation in the ineffable thoughts and judgments of God must mean that he is "within" God, for nothing that is external, i.e., created, could have such intimate knowledge.

One would expect this argument to occur with greater frequency than it actually does in Basil's later treatise against those who denied the full divinity of the Spirit. In addition to the instance mentioned above, the text is explicitly quoted on only one other occasion. In *Spir.* 19.50 Basil cites Eustathius' inference from Rom 8:26 that the Spirit should not be glorified together with the Father and the Son. Just as the suppliant is inferior to his benefactor, so the Spirit's role as intercessor can mean only that he falls short of the dignity of the Father.¹⁹⁰ In order to reveal the fallaciousness of Eustathius' reasoning, Basil cites a number of Scriptural passages and then concludes:¹⁹¹

Do you call the Spirit a servant? But, it says, 'the servant does not know what his master does' [Jn 15:15], but the Spirit knows the thoughts of God, just as the spirit of a man [knows] the thoughts within him [1 Cor 2:11].

Eustathius' argument from Rom 8:26 implies that the Spirit is a servant, that is, on an equal footing with every other creature under God (ὁμόδουλος).¹⁹² Basil's concluding riposte to this argument cites Jn 15:15 to show that the Spirit, if he is a servant, is ignorant of what is in God's mind. However, such a hypothesis conflicts with the evidence of 1 Cor 2:11. The Spirit knows the thoughts of God, just as the human spirit knows the thoughts of a man. Consequently, the Spirit cannot be a servant, but must be given the same honour as the Father and the Son.¹⁹³

Why does 1 Cor 2:11 appear so infrequently in *Spir.* when Basil accords it high praise in *Spir.* 16.40 and when it has a significant place in his early work against Eunomius, especially in *Eun.* 3.4? Pelikan¹⁹⁴ suggests that forceful use of the analogy between the divine Spirit and the human spirit could lead to a Sabellian understanding of the Holy Spirit. The fear of Sabellianism, a fear from which Basil was not

¹⁹⁰ P.101.1-3; PG 32.160A. See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 82; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 47 and n. 3.

¹⁹¹ P.101.21-24; PG 32.160C.

¹⁹² On this term, see Špidlík, *Sophiologie*, pp. 46, 47; Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 348-349, n. 2.

¹⁹³ Cf. *ep.* 251.4 (III, 92.15-16; PG 32.937C).

¹⁹⁴ *Catholic Tradition*, pp. 214-215. Heising ("Der Heilige Geist", p.293, n. 159; cf. Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", pp. 355-356) suggests that Basil's high praise for 1 Cor 2:11 may stem from his experiences as an ascetic. To be sure, Basil's religious experience cannot be discounted in any consideration of his theology and exegesis. Nonetheless, this reason does not account for the little use which Basil makes of the Pauline text in *Spir.*

exempt,¹⁹⁵ was an especial bugbear of the eastern church. But if this is the case, how is Basil's detailed exposition of 1 Cor 2:11 in *Eun.* 3.4, along with the other two references to this text in *Eun.* 1.14 and 3.6, to be explained? Heising has noted striking similarities between some of the Scriptural texts and themes used by Athanasius in his letters to Serapion, especially in *ep. Serap.* 1.22-27, and those employed by Basil in his third book against Eunomius.¹⁹⁶ Evidently, the young Cappadocian author, finding his first theological treatise a difficult endeavour, turned to the work of the respected Alexandrian bishop for inspiration and direction.¹⁹⁷ The analogy derived from 1 Cor 2:11 (first treated in *ep. Serap.* 1.22) is an important weapon in Athanasius' defence of the Spirit's divinity.¹⁹⁸ Basil seems to have been influenced by Athanasius' use of the text, included a detailed exposition of it in *Eun.* 3.4, and only later, upon reflection, became fully cognizant of the fact that the exposition could be construed in a Sabellian sense.¹⁹⁹ Thus, by the time that Basil came to write *Spir.*, the dangerous inferences which could be drawn from the analogy in 1 Cor 2:11 were quite apparent to the Cappadocian, and despite his grandiose claim for the text (prompted in part by Athanasius' exegesis of the verse), its exposition was curtailed. An excellent summary of Basil's position in this regard is offered by his statement that it is more in accord with right doctrine to say that the Spirit dwells with (συνεῖναι) the Father and Son rather than in (ἐνεῖναι) them.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁵ Cf., for example, *epp.* 125.1 (II, 31.26-32.49; *PG* 32. 545D-548B); 126 (II, 35.17-36.33; *PG* 32.552C-553A); 207.1 (II, 184.1230; *PG* 32.760B-761A); 210.3-6 (II, 204-206; *PG* 32.772A-777D); 226.4 (III, 28.12-18; *PG* 32.849B-C); 265.2 (III, 128.7-130.35; *PG* 32.985A-D). See also Courtonne, *Temoin*, pp. 134-167; Verhees, "Mitteilbarkeit", pp. 10-12, 22-23.

¹⁹⁶ "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 285, nn. 122, 124; 286, n. 128; 289-290.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 289-290. Cf. Kopecek, *Neo-Arianism*, II, 364.

¹⁹⁸ See pp. 78-83.

¹⁹⁹ For evidence that 1 Cor 2:11 could be construed in a manner resembling Sabellianism, see pp. 214-215.

²⁰⁰ *Spir.* 26.63 (p.122.1-2; *PG* 32.184B). It should be borne in mind that for Basil the danger of Sabellianism was not simply an academic one. During the early seventies, he was embroiled in a fierce struggle with a relative named Atarbius, bishop of Neocaesarea in Pontus. Atarbius affirmed that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one entity which varies in appearance (ἐν πράγματι πολυπρόσωπον) and one hypostasis [*ep.* 210.3 (II, 192.15-17; *PG* 32.772B)]. Moreover, Atarbius claimed that in teaching such concepts he was heir to the thought of Gregory Thaumaturgus, whose episcopal seat he occupied. But to Basil, Atarbius was an heir not to the revered Gregory, but to Sabellius! Now, their struggle coincided with that period of time in which Basil was at work on his *magnum opus* on the Holy Spirit. No wonder that Basil made scant use of an analogy which his "Sabellian" opponents could exploit!

On the struggle between Basil and Atarbius, see Jean Daniélou, "L'Adversus Arium et Sabellium de Grégoire de Nysse et l'origénisme cappadocien", *RSR*, TIV (1966), 63-66;

Although little use is made of 1 Cor 2:11 in *Spir.*, the allied texts of 1 Cor 2:10 and 2:12 do receive slightly more attention. Basil's exegesis of the first text, 1 Cor 2:10, in *Spir.* tends to focus upon the revelatory function of the Holy Spirit. This tendency is foreshadowed in a terse statement from *hom.* 20, given *ca.* 364.²⁰¹ The truly wise man will not glory in his wisdom for, as the preacher tells his congregation:²⁰²

God reveals through his own Spirit his wisdom, which has been foreordained for our glory.

True wisdom is a gift from God which is imparted to men and women through his Holy Spirit. Consequently, it affords no basis for human pride, but compels men and women to recognize their dependence upon God.

The same concept, that God gives knowledge through his Spirit, appears, again apropos of 1 Cor 2:10, in *Spir.* 24.56, but here it is employed for a different purpose. Eustathius had conceded that the Spirit is to be glorified, but not together with the Father and the Son. To Basil this "concession" implied that the Spirit is to be ranked together with the creatures and for the bishop of Caesarea this would have been improper. Basil knows of many Scriptural proofs to substantiate his position, but to go into them all would require a special treatise.²⁰³ Nonetheless, Basil feels obliged to mention at least a few of these proofs, of which one contains an allusion to 1 Cor 2:10. He writes:²⁰⁴

[The Spirit] knows the depths of God, but the creation receives the revelation of ineffable realities through the Spirit.

The Spirit cannot belong among the creatures, since he gives them knowledge of the ineffable truths about God. The possession of such knowledge must mean that the Spirit belongs to the Godhead, and thus it is perverse to separate him from the Father and Son.²⁰⁵

Luise Abramowski, "Das Bekenntnis des Gregor Thaumaturgus bei Gregor von Nyssa und das Problem seiner Echtheit", *ZKG*, LXXXVII (1976), 153-160; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 115-118. Note should also be taken of Basil's difference of opinion with his brother Gregory of Nyssa with regard to the latter's overtures to the followers of Marcellus of Ancyra *ca.* 372. See *ep.* 100 (I, 219.24-29; *PG* 32.505A); Gerhard May, "Gregor von Nyssa in der Kirchenpolitik seiner Zeit", *JÖBG*, XV (1966), 106-109; Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 200-209.

²⁰¹ For the date, see Bernardi, *Prédication*, pp. 66-67; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 140.

²⁰² *Hom.* 20.3 (*PG* 31.532A). For an appreciation of the passage in which this sentence occurs, see Amand, *Ascèse*, p. 313. See also Maximos Aghiorghoussis, "Applications of the Theme 'Eikon Theou' (Image of God) according to Saint Basil the Great", *GOTR*, XXI (1976), 283-284.

²⁰³ *Spir.* 24.55 (p. 111.1-26; *PG* 32.172A-C). On the discussion about the identity of this special treatise, see excursus III.

²⁰⁴ P. 112.3-5; *PG* 32.172C. Cf. *ep.* 159.2 (II, 87.17-18, 20-21; *PG* 32.621A).

²⁰⁵ *Spir.* 24.56 (p. 112.13-19; *PG* 32.173A).

1 Cor 2:10 reappears in *Spir.* 16.38, where Basil cites only the first half of the verse. In *Spir.* 16 Basil attempts to prove in greater detail a point briefly made in *Spir.* 11, that the Holy Spirit is inseparable from the Father and the Son. In order to achieve this aim, Basil considers the co-operation of the Spirit with the Father and Son in the work of creation, redemption and sanctification.²⁰⁶ For instance, those activities of the Spirit that Basil had observed among monks striving to live the angelic life, in particular the manifestation of spiritual gifts and the revelation of mysteries, are a reflection of what happens within the angelic community.²⁰⁷ As Basil writes:²⁰⁸

I even affirm that Gabriel prophesies of future events in no other way than by the foreknowledge of the Spirit, since prophecy is one of the spiritual gifts from the Spirit's allotment. And where did the one who was ordered to make plain the mysteries of the vision 'to the man of desires' [Dan 10:11] obtain the wisdom to teach that which was hidden, except from the Holy Spirit? The revelation of mysteries belongs specifically to the Spirit, as it is written, 'God has revealed [them] to us through the Spirit' [1 Cor 2:10].

The prediction of the future by Gabriel was impossible without the Spirit's gift of foreknowledge. Similarly, the wisdom to reveal the mysteries hidden within the vision given to Daniel could have come only from the Spirit. For, as 1 Cor 2:10 bears witness, the disclosure of mysteries belongs especially to the Spirit. On this basis Basil concludes that the Spirit has to be recognized as an integral member of the Godhead since no creature can provide another creature with the ability to understand divine mysteries.

Basil's interpretation of 1 Cor 2:10 in *Spir.* reflects his great interest in the revelatory function of the Spirit, an interest which he had inherited from Origen²⁰⁹ and which was increased by his involvement in the charismatic life of his monastic communities. Nevertheless, the illumination given by the Spirit cannot be divorced from the work of the Father and the Son. The Spirit's imparting to the angels of prophetic knowledge and insight into hidden realities should be regarded as one aspect of the creative work of the entire Godhead.²¹⁰ As for the manifestation of the

²⁰⁶ See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 149, n.1.

²⁰⁷ On the ascetic aspiration to live the "angelic life", see pp. 124 and n. 125; 128-129.

²⁰⁸ *Spir.* 16.38 (pp. 81.23-82.1; PG 32.137C). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 149-150.

²⁰⁹ Central to Origen's conception of the Christian life is the interpretation and comprehension of the truths about God which are hidden in the Scriptures. However, according to Origen, such knowledge is impossible without the Spirit who inspired those Scriptures. He is able to bring the obscure passages of Scripture to light and so lead the believer to a deeper knowledge of God. See Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, pp. 127-134.

²¹⁰ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 151.

same spiritual gifts among men and women,²¹¹ their exercise inevitably leads to a growth in the knowledge of the Father and the Son.²¹²

Although Basil holds back from discussing the nature of the Spirit's relationship to God on the basis of 1 Cor 2:11, he does treat cautiously the question of the Spirit's mode of existence apropos of 1 Cor 2:12 in *Spir.* 18.46. An examination of Basil's earlier discussion of the Spirit's mode of existence reveals that the treatment in *Spir.* 18.46 is the final fruit of a meditation which reaches back to the treatise against Eunomius. There, Basil regarded it as a mark of true piety to confess without shame one's ignorance about the Spirit's mode of existence.²¹³ In the later *ep.* 125, which contains the document that Basil prepared with the help of Meletius and Theodotus in 373 as a written confession of Eustathius' orthodoxy, Basil is prepared to go a little further.

We do not say that the Holy Spirit is either unbegotten, for we know one unbegotten and one source of what exists, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or begotten, for we have been taught by the tradition of the Faith that there is one Only-Begotten. But since we have been taught that the Spirit of truth proceeds from the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι) we confess that he is from God without being created (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι . . . ἀκτίστως).²¹⁴

From the wording in the final sentence of this text it seems that the

²¹¹ Looked at from Basil's point of view, the ability to behold divine mysteries belongs only to those who are harmonious instruments in the hands of the Spirit [*hom. in Ps.* 45.1 (PG 29.416B-C)]. Such were the Old Testament prophets, to whom hidden truths were revealed because their eyes were fixed upon the Spirit [*hom. in Ps.* 44.9 (PG 29.405C)]. Since they heeded him they received the wisdom of God and were able to expound that wisdom for the edification of others [*hom. in Ps.* 48.2 (PG 29.436B-C)].

Moreover, this insight into divine mysteries, which is given by the Spirit, is not a gift relegated to the past. For Basil, it is a present reality, as is shown by his almost hymnic discussion of the Spirit and his activities in *Spir.* 9.23. Those who are illumined by the Spirit, that is the Spirit-bearing souls, receive such gifts as foreknowledge of the future, the understanding of mysteries, and the apprehension of hidden realities (pp. 53.14-54.1; PG 32.109B-C).

Basil thus expects the superiors of his monastic communities to be able to anticipate the future, so as to bring their brethren to perfection. It should be noted that Basil's emphasis on order within the body of Christ leads him to understand this anticipation of the future and insight into hidden realities more as prudent foresight and growth in the knowledge of God than as events of a spectacular and miraculous nature. However, this refusal to tolerate "enthusiasm" does not lessen Basil's appreciation of them as gifts of the Spirit. See Karl Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Monchthum. Eine Studie zu Symeon dem Neuen Theologen* (1898 ed.; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969), p. 166; Pierre Humbertclaude, *La Doctrine ascétique de saint Basile de Césarée* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils, 1932), pp. 316-318; Amand, *Ascèse*, pp. 142-144.

²¹² Letter received from P.J. Fedwick (April 1, 1981). Cf. Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 90-95.

²¹³ *Eun.* 3.6 (PG 29.668 B-C); 3.7 (PG 29.669C-D). See also Holl, *Amphilochius*, p. 139; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 13.

²¹⁴ *Ep.* 125.3 (II, 34.28-34; PG 32.549C). For the historical context of this statement, see pp. 35-38. Cf. *ep.* 105 (II, 7.25; PG 32.513B), which states that the Spirit has his existence from God (ἐκ θεοῦ ὑπαρχον).

teaching that Basil has in mind is Jn 15:26. There is, however, a subtle difference between the Johannine text and Basil's rendition: the Johannine "from" (παρά) has been replaced by "from within" (ἐκ). 1 Cor 2:12 has surely been influential in this regard, for it states that the Spirit is from (ἐκ) God. Possible confirmation that 1 Cor 2:12 was in view at this point is given in the phrase which follows; the words "from God" (ἐκ θεοῦ) come directly from 1 Cor 2:12. As to the details of the Spirit's origin, the phrase "without being created" is considered sufficient. As well as supplying an effective defence against the Pneumatomachian assertion that the Spirit must be a creature because he is neither unbegotten nor begotten,²¹⁵ it provides a non-speculative statement on the mode of the Spirit's existence.

In *hom.* 24, probably given sometime after 373 and before the completion of *Spir.*,²¹⁶ Basil recognizes that this question requires further discussion. He presents his position in two passages. In the first,²¹⁷ Basil takes his starting-point from the alternatives posed by his Pneumatomachian opponents: the Spirit is either unbegotten or begotten, or if he is neither of these, he must be a creature. But, Basil replies, none of these epithets apply to the Spirit. He is inseparable from the Father, since he proceeds from the Father. Also, he is intimately linked to the Son, as the names "Spirit of truth" (cf. Jn 14:17; 15:26) and "Spirit of sonship" (Rom 8:15) indicate. The possibilities presented by the Pneumatomachi concerning the Spirit's mode of existence cannot therefore be exhaustive. Since men are ignorant of so many other realities in the universe, his opponents would be wise to confess their ignorance about the Spirit's mode of existence without feeling ashamed. With this exhortation for a confession of pious ignorance, Basil reiterates the position that was given in *Eun.* 3.6. The second passage from *hom.* 24 elucidates a further reason for such a confession. Basil writes:²¹⁸

If the Spirit is from God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), with what right do you place him among the creatures? For by no means will you produce this [Scripture]: 'all things are from God' [cf. 1 Cor 11:12]. For just as Christ is said to be of God, but is not a creature like us ('for we are of Christ, and Christ is of God' [1 Cor 3:23]), so we are said to be of Christ in a different way, as servants of a master. But Christ is said to be of God, as the Son of the Father. In a similar fashion

²¹⁵ For a discussion of this Pneumatomachian assertion, see Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 60.

²¹⁶ See excursus III.

²¹⁷ *Hom.* 24.6 (PG 31.612B-613A). See also Manlio Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum "Augustinianum", 1975), pp. 496-497; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 60, n. 107.

²¹⁸ *Hom.* 24.7 (PG 31.616B,C).

[this is the case with] the Spirit, who is not like all things because all things are from God... [For], even if all things are said to be from God, the Son and the Spirit are from God in a special sense, since the Son issues forth from the Father and the Spirit proceeds from the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται). The Son [issues forth] from the Father by generation, but the Spirit [proceeds] ineffably from God (ἀρρήτως ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ).

The call for a confession of ignorance about the Spirit's mode of existence is not one that is grounded in agnosticism.²¹⁹ For Scripture itself is silent about the Spirit's mode of existence, although it does reveal that he is from God in a special sense. Basil is well aware that his opponents might claim that the Spirit is created on the basis of a text such as 1 Cor 11:12, which states that "all things", that is all created entities, are from God. To forestall such a move, Basil, by means of 1 Cor 3:23, draws a comparison between Christ and the Spirit. Two modes of existence are indicated by this text. There is that of believers, who are of Christ as servants of a master, and there is that of Christ, who is of God as the Son of the Father. Similarly, all things are from God as creatures, but the Spirit is from God in a special and ineffable sense. Thus, Scripture itself calls for a confession of ignorance about the Spirit's mode of existence. In accordance with the principle laid down in *Eun.* 3.7, Basil refuses to go beyond what is stated in Scripture in these discussions about the Spirit's mode of existence. Holl rightly remarks that it is entirely in keeping with this Biblicistic frame of mind that Basil never considered coining a term like "procession" (ἐκπόρευσις) in order to provide a more positive explanation of the Spirit's mode of existence.²²⁰

However, in two passages from *Spir.*, Basil does offer an explanation which is somewhat more positive than that conveyed by the terms "without being created" and "ineffably". In the first passage, from *Spir.* 16.38,²²¹ he gives a positive statement about the Spirit's mode of existence, which is suggested by Ps 33:6 and Jn 15:26: the Spirit proceeds from God the Father as the breath of his mouth.²²² The second passage, from *Spir.* 18.46, provides a detailed expansion of this image.

[The Spirit] is said to be from God (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) [cf. 1 Cor 2:12], not in the way that all things are from God, but as one who proceeds from God. He does not [proceed] by generation like the Son, but like the breath of his mouth. Of

²¹⁹ Cf. Thomas Molnar, *Theists and Atheists. A Typology of Non-Belief* (The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers, 1980), pp. 150-151.

²²⁰ Holl, *Amphilochius*, p. 139. On Basil's Biblicism, see pp. 114-120. On the use of the term "procession" by Gregory of Nazianzus, see pp. 175-176.

²²¹ P. 80, 7-14; PG 32.136C.

²²² See Simonetti, *Crisi ariana*, p. 497; Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 208-209.

course, the mouth [of God] is not a physical member, nor is the Spirit breath that is dissipated. But the term ‘mouth’ [is to be understood] in a manner worthy of God, and the Spirit is a living being, who has the power of sanctification. From this [analogy] their fellowship is made clear and the ineffable mode of [the Spirit’s] existence safeguarded.²²³

The description of the Spirit in 1 Cor 2:12, that he is from God, raises the question of how the Spirit is from God. Basil is chary of answering this question lest he violate the advice which he gave in *Eun.* 3.7. Yet, he is prepared to state that the Spirit is from God, neither in the manner of the Son (thus he is not a “brother” to the Son²²⁴), nor in the fashion of a created being (as some might deduce from 1 Cor 11:12), but as breath from the mouth of God, an analogy suggested by Ps 33:6. Basil is quick to add that the terms “breath” and “mouth” must be understood in a way that is befitting to God. Thus, the comparison of the Spirit with breath does not mean that he is the same as human breath, which quickly dissipates upon exhalation, for the Spirit is a living being with the power to sanctify others.²²⁵ This image, which Basil derives from Scripture, reflects the dialectic that is always involved in humanity’s knowledge of God. On the one hand, despite its limitations, it indicates clearly the intimate union which exists between the Father and the Spirit, so that the Spirit has to be glorified together with the Father and the Son. On the other hand, these same limitations are a reminder that the Spirit’s mode of existence is ineffable, even as the being of the Godhead remains incomprehensible to the human mind.²²⁶

It may be said in conclusion that although Basil praises 1 Cor 2:11 as the most important witness of the inseparable relationship between the Spirit and the Father, it possesses little significance for his argument against Eustathius. Basil recognizes the important function that this text has in Athanasius’ letters to Serapion, but he is wary of using it, since he realizes that it could be misconstrued in a Sabellian sense. On the other hand, 1 Cor 2:10 is interpreted in terms of Basil’s understanding of the Spirit as the revealer of divine mysteries. Consequently, the Spirit

²²³ P.93.1-9; *PG* 32.152B. See also Verhees, “Mitteilbarkeit”, p. 14.

²²⁴ McIntyre, “Holy Spirit”, pp. 368-369.

²²⁵ For further discussion, see Benoît Pruche “L’Originalité du traité de saint Basile sur le Saint-Esprit”, *RSPT*, XXXII (1948), 218-219; *idem*, *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 206-217, *passim*. Pruche suggests that Basil’s use of this analogy is bold compared to Athanasius’ express reluctance to discuss the mode of the Spirit’s existence. However, Athanasius does not entirely overlook this question (see p. 83). Moreover, Basil is quick to check his “boldness” with the term “ineffable”, as Pruche notes (“Originalité”, pp. 218-219; *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 215-216).

²²⁶ This explanation of the Spirit’s mode of existence recurs in *hom. in Ps.* 32.4 (*PG* 29.333A-B).

must be ranked with the Father and the Son, for only a member of the Godhead can reveal divine knowledge. As for 1 Cor 2:12, this text provides a non-speculative statement about the Spirit's mode of existence: he is from God.²²⁷ When pressed further as to the difference between the way in which the Spirit is from God and the way in which the creatures are from God, Basil comes up with an image derived from Ps 33:6: the Spirit is from God as the breath of his mouth. Beyond this image Basil refuses to go. Moreover, in order to protect himself against the charge of prying into matters reserved for God alone, Basil adds that this image, when properly understood, actually safeguards the ineffable mode of the Spirit's existence.

6. The Charismatic Spirit

It was inevitable that Basil, "the monastic bishop",²²⁸ would draw upon his experience of the gifts of the Spirit within the monastic community in order to provide support for his view of the Spirit. This base of support is first established with texts from 1 Cor in *Spir.* 16.37. There, Basil endeavours to demonstrate the inseparable relationship which the Spirit has with the Father and the Son from the results of prophetic speech (1 Cor 14:24-25) and from the Spirit's distribution of the spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:4-6, 11). He writes:²²⁹

Now let us go back to the point raised at the outset, that in everything the Holy Spirit is inseparable and completely indivisible from the Father and Son. In the passage concerning the gift of tongues,²³⁰ Paul writes to the Corinthians: 'If all of you prophesy, and an unbeliever or layman enters, he is convicted by

²²⁷ For two other instances of Basil's use of 1 Cor 2:12, see *Spir.* 24.57 (pp. 112.20-113.10; *PG* 32.173A-B); *ep.* 52.4 (I, 136.5137.21; *PG* 32.396B-C). For the use of 1 Cor 2:12 in *ep.* 52.4, see p. 151, n. 245.

²²⁸ See the comments by Lukas Vischer, *Basilius der Grosse. Untersuchungen zu einem Kirchenvater des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Basel: Bruckdruckerei F. Reinhardt, 1953), pp. 51-53.

²²⁹ Pp. 77.19-79.5; *PG* 32.133A-D.

²³⁰ According to a study by Harold Hunter ["Tongues-Speech: A Patristic Analysis", *JETS*, XXIII (1980), 133] "the Cappadocian Fathers...uniformly spoke of the contemporary exercise of charismata and perhaps also of tongues-speech". Hunter's proof that Basil was possibly acquainted with believers who exercised the gift of glossolalia is *reg. br.* 278 (*PG* 31.1277C-D) where Basil discusses the meaning of 1 Cor 14:14.

However, Basil's discussion of this text does not substantiate Hunter's statement. Basil writes: "How does a man's spirit pray while his mind is unfruitful? This was said about those who utter their prayer in a tongue unknown to the hearers. For he says: 'If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful' [1 Cor 14:14]. For when the words of the prayer are unknown to those who are present, the understanding of him who prays is unfruitful since no one is benefited. But when those who are present understand the prayer, which is able to benefit the hearers, then he who prays has the improvement of those who are benefited as a fruit. The same applies to every utterance of God's words. For it is written:

all, he is called to account by all, the secrets of his heart are disclosed; and so he will fall on his face and worship God, declaring that God is certainly among you' [1 Cor 14:24-25]. Therefore, if God is recognized to be present in the prophets from their prophecy, which the Spirit produces according to the variety of the spiritual gifts, let them decide what position they will give to the Holy Spirit: whether it is more just to rank him with God or expel him to the created realm. [The rebuke] of Sapphira by Peter: 'How could you have agreed together to test the Holy Spirit' [Acts 5:9], 'You have not lied to men, but to God' [Acts 5:4] shows that sins committed against the Holy Spirit and against God are the same. Thus, you learn that in every [divine] operation the Holy Spirit is united with and inseparable from the Father and Son. When God produces the varieties of ministries, the Holy Spirit is present together [with them], freely administering (αὐτεξουσίως οἰκονομοῦν) the distribution of the spiritual gifts according to the worthiness of each [recipient]. 'For,' it says, 'there are varieties of spiritual gifts, but the same Spirit; and varieties of ministries, but the same Lord, and varieties of operations, but the same God, who produces all in all' [1 Cor 12:4-6]. 'But one and the same Spirit,' it says, 'produces all these things, distributing to each one as he wills' [1 Cor 12:11]. Now, because the Apostle mentioned the Spirit first in this passage, and the Son second, and God the Father third, it is not at all necessary to believe that the [baptismal] order has been reversed. For the Apostle begins from human relationships. When we receive gifts, we encounter first the one who distributes [them], then we think of the one who sent them, then [finally] we raise our thoughts to the fountain and source of the good gifts.

For the purpose of analysis this text can be divided into two sections. The first section focuses upon the implications of 1 Cor 14:24-25 and Acts 5:9,4, while the second revolves around the interpretation of 1 Cor 12:4-6 and 12:11. Both sections move towards the same goal: the demonstration of the inseparable relationship which holds between the Spirit and the Father and Son.

Basil begins with two examples from the religious experience of the early Church.²³¹ When, according to 1 Cor 14:24-25, the gift of prophecy, which is made possible by the Spirit's presence, leads to the acknowledgment that God is present in the prophets, then the Spirit and God (the Father) must be simultaneously present, and by inference, inseparably linked. Acts 5:9 and 5:4 point to a similar conclusion. Since lying to the Spirit is equivalent to lying to God (the Father), then the Spirit must belong to God, and not to the created realm.²³²

'But only what is helpful for the edification of the faith' [Eph 4:29]" (trans. Clarke, *Ascetic Works*, p. 336, revised).

In this text, Basil envisages a situation in which a man's prayer is in a language unknown to others who are present. Since they are not edified, the prayer can be considered fruitless for the one who prayed. Basil gives no indication that he conceived of the one who prayed as being unable to understand the words of his own prayer, as in the case of one who exercises the gift of glossolalia. See also Amand, *Ascèse*, pp. 142-143, 144.

²³¹ Cf. the comments by Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", p. 293, n. 159.

²³² See Melcher, *Der 8. Brief*, p. 145.

Of greater interest from a scholarly point of view is the second section of this passage, wherein Basil gives an interpretation of two of his favourite texts, 1 Cor 12:4-6 and 12:11. These two texts first appear together in *Eun.* 3.4,²³³ where Basil argues for the divinity of the Spirit on the basis of activities which the Spirit has in common with the Father and the Son.²³⁴ Basil writes:²³⁵

What are the activities of the Holy Spirit? ...Just as the Father is said to distribute the operations to those who are worthy of receiving them and the Son [is said] to distribute the ministries among those deemed worthy of them, so the Holy Spirit is declared to distribute the spiritual gifts to those worthy of receiving them. 'There are varieties of spiritual gifts, but the same Spirit; and varieties of ministries, but the same Lord; and varieties of operations, but the same God who produces all in all' [1 Cor 12:4-6]. Do you see how the activity of the Holy Spirit is regarded as co-ordinate with the activity of the Father and Son? Moreover, the divine nature of the Holy Spirit is manifest to an even greater degree from what follows. For what does it say? 'But one and the same Spirit produces all these things, distributing to each one as he wills' [1 Cor 12:11]. Nothing less than independent authority befitting a lord (αὐθεντικὴν καὶ δεσποτικὴν ἐξουσίαν) is testified of him. Wherefore in the New Testament the prophets cried, 'Thus says the Holy Spirit' [Acts 21:11].

Eunomius had claimed that since the Spirit is third in rank he must be third in nature, and consequently different in nature from the Father and the Son.²³⁶ Against this claim Basil cites 1 Cor 12:4-6 in order to demonstrate that the association of the Spirit there with the Father and the Son implies a common nature. 1 Cor 12:11 provides even greater evidence of the Spirit's divine nature. The phrase "as he wills" indicates that the Spirit freely exercises his authority in a manner befitting a lord. Acts 21:11 confirms this interpretation. The phrase "Thus says the Holy Spirit" is seen as a rough parallel to the statement "Thus says the Lord", which is especially prevalent in the Old Testament.²³⁷ The Spirit acts sovereignly in all that he does.

Behind Basil's interpretation of the phrase "as he wills" (1 Cor 12:11) lies the crucial antithesis which his argument seeks to set before Eunomius: either the Spirit is divine or else he is a creature, either he is a lord (δεσπότης) or else he is a servant.²³⁸ This antithesis is axiomatic for

²³³ These two texts are found together also in Ps.-Basil, *hom. Spir.* (PG 31.1429A-B). On this tract, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 187-189.

²³⁴ Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", pp. 115, 118-119.

²³⁵ PG 29.661B, 664A-B.

²³⁶ See p. 45, n. 205

²³⁷ See David Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), pp. 77, 107.

²³⁸ See *Eun.* 2.31 (PG 29.644C). See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 11; 128, n. 2; Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", pp. 284, 285.

Basil²³⁹ and determines his later exegesis of 1 Cor 12:11. For instance, in *hom.* 15.3, given at some point between 372 and 375,²⁴⁰ Basil makes a brief statement about 1 Cor 12:11 which is reminiscent of that of *Eun.* 3.4.

[The Spirit] does not minister the gifts as a servant (λειτουργικῶς) but he distributes them as a sovereign (ἀθηντικῶς). For it says, “He distributes to each one as he wills” [1 Cor 12:11]. Although he is sent by divine dispensation (οἰκονομικῶς), he acts on his own volition (ἐνεργεῖ δὲ αὐτεξουσίως)²⁴¹

Once again, the antithesis mentioned above is presented apropos of 1 Cor 12:11: in the distribution of the spiritual gifts, the Spirit acts, not as a servant, but as a lord. Although *hom.* 15 can scarcely be considered a polemical work, Basil wants to leave his audience with no doubt as to the Spirit’s relationship to the created realm.²⁴² The Spirit distributes the gifts as one who is lord and without constraint. This statement clearly shows the Spirit’s superiority to the members of the created realm. However, in *Spir.* 16.37 this exposition of 1 Cor 12:11 has receded into the background, while that of 1 Cor 12:4-6 has become the real focus of attention. Yet, the exposition of 1 Cor 12:11 which has been given in *Eun.* 3.4 and *hom.* 15.3 is not altogether forgotten, for the statement that the Spirit freely administers (αὐτεξουσίως οἰκονομοῦν) the spiritual gifts²⁴³ is a witness to its presence.²⁴⁴

In *Eun.* 3.4, 1 Cor 12:4-6 was employed to show that the members of the Trinity must have a common nature if they share in the same activities. The use of 1 Cor 12:4-6 in *Spir.* 16.37 is somewhat similar. The Spirit is inseparably present in every activity produced by the Father and the Son. This implies that all three share a common nature. However, a new element enters the picture with the explanation which follows the citation of 1 Cor 12:4-6 in *Spir.* 16.37. From the order of the divine

²³⁹ See pp. 154-156.

²⁴⁰ Bernardi (*Prédication*, pp. 85-86) places this homily in 372, a dating with which Fedwick (*Charisma*, p. 145) concurs. Dörries (*De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 99), Heising (“Heilige Geist”, p. 280), Dehnhard (*Problem*, p. 15) and Verhees (“Transzendenz”, pp. 290, n. 19; 294), on the other hand, date this homily ca. 374-375.

²⁴¹ PG 31.47A. See also *fid.* 4 (PG 31.685C).

²⁴² Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 99-100.

²⁴³ The linguistic parallel between this statement and that from *hom.* 15.3 should not be overlooked. Pruche (*Saint-Esprit*, p. 171) discerns a “Stoic flavour” in Basil’s use of the term αὐτεξουσίως.

²⁴⁴ In *Spir.* 16.39 (pp. 83.1-84.8; PG 32.140B-141A) Basil proceeds to list a number of activities, from the blessings given to the patriarchs to the arrangement of the gifts in the Church, in which the Spirit is inseparably present with the Father and the Son. The last activity mentioned in this section, the Spirit’s arrangement of the gifts in the Church, is an excellent illustration of the point which Basil makes in *Spir.* 16.37 through the citation of 1 Cor 12:11.

persons given in these verses it should not be concluded that the order given in the baptismal command (Mt 28:19) has been reversed. The danger against which Basil is seeking to protect himself in what follows is perhaps the slanderous report about his teaching which his Pneumatomachian opponents circulated during the course of the struggle over the divinity of the Holy Spirit. According to this report, Basil regarded the Spirit as logically prior to the Father and the Son.²⁴⁵ This slander may have had its origin in either a misunderstanding or a deliberate distortion of Basil's teaching on the way in which God reveals himself. This teaching can be summed up as follows: the illumination of the Spirit leads men "upwards" to the Son, and from the contemplation of the Son they finally attain to the vision of the Father.²⁴⁶ In fact, it is this teaching that shapes the explanation which Basil gives for the order of the divine persons in 1 Cor 12:4-6.²⁴⁷ The order works "upwards" from the encounter with the one who distributes the spiritual gifts to the one who sent him and finally to the ultimate origin of the gifts. For Basil, this is not merely an order which is based upon human experience, but corresponds to the way in which God has chosen to reveal himself.²⁴⁸ Moreover, as Pelikan rightly points out,²⁴⁹ Basil's interpretation of 1 Cor 12:4-6 by means of his image theology provides him with yet another conclusion, which is a fundamental datum of his trinitarian theology: the Godhead is composed of three distinct and co-eternal members. For, following the clearest description of this image theology in *Spir.* 18.47,²⁵⁰ Basil states:²⁵¹

The way of the knowledge of God is from the one Spirit, through the one Son to the one Father. And conversely, the natural goodness, the inherent holiness and the royal dignity extends from the Father through the Only-Begotten to the Spirit. In this way, the hypostases are confessed and the pious dogma of the monarchy is not lost.

Alongside this concept of the hypostatic differentiation within the

²⁴⁵ See *epp.* 125.3 (II, 34.39-49; *PG* 32.549C-552A); 251.4 (III, 92.9-14; *PG* 32.937B-C). Basil's most detailed reply to the slander is in *ep.* 52.4 (I, 136.5-137.21; *PG* 32.396B-C), written *ca.* 375-376 to a community of consecrated virgins. If, Basil says, he actually taught that the Spirit was logically prior to the Father, then his teaching would contradict what is stated by 1 Cor 2:12, namely that the Spirit is from God. Here, Basil understands this phrase to mean that the Spirit is logically posterior to the Father, the source of the Godhead. See also the analysis of this text by Verhees, "Mitteilbarkeit", pp. 12-13, 14, 15.

²⁴⁶ *Spir.* 9.23 (p.53.9-12; *PG* 32.109B); 18.47 (pp. 94.1795.22; *PG* 32.153A-C).

²⁴⁷ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 144-145.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 145. Cf. Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", p.353.

²⁴⁹ "Spiritual Sense", p. 353.

²⁵⁰ See pp. 125-126.

²⁵¹ P.95.16-22; *PG* 32.153B-C.

Godhead, another concept, which is just as important for Basil, is displayed within this text, namely, that of the Father as the source of the being and activity of the Son and the Spirit.²⁵² This concept of the Father's "monarchy" is also instrumental in shaping the exposition of 1 Cor 12:4-6 in *Spir.* 16.37. For there, the Father is described as "the fountain and source of the good gifts" which are bestowed upon men. It is of the greatest importance to remember that neither of these concepts was merely an intellectual construct for Basil. For him, as for Athanasius, they were meant to inspire genuine worship of the one Godhead which is revealed as Father, Son, and Spirit.²⁵³

7. *The Spirit as Lord*

During the winter of 374-375, Eustathius wrote an open letter against Basil to a certain Dazizas, and included along with it some passages which, taken alone, might well be interpreted in a Sabellian sense. The obvious implication behind the inclusion of these passages was that the bishop of Caesarea was either their author or was in full agreement with them.²⁵⁴ In a letter to Meletius of Antioch written a few months later, Basil cites one of these passages:²⁵⁵

[The letter to Dazizas] contains such expressions as these: 'Therefore it is necessary to conceive the first identity always in conjunction, or, rather in union, with the difference, and to say that the second and third [identities] are the same. For what the Father is firstly, the Son is this secondly and the Spirit thirdly. And again, what the Spirit is firstly, the Son is this secondly, in so far as the Lord is also the Spirit [cf. 2 Cor 3:17], and the Father thirdly, in so far as the Spirit is God [cf. Jn 4:24]. And, to express the inexpressible with greater force, the Father is the Son paternally and the Son is the Father filially. And likewise with the Spirit, in so far as the Trinity is one God.'

The tract from which this passage is taken is evidently a letter, or a rough draft of a letter, written by Apollinaris to Basil, though it is probable that

²⁵² On the concept of the Father's "monarchy" in Basil, see Prestige, *God*, pp. 254-255; Verhees, "Mitteilbarkeit", pp 12-19, *passim*; Dietrich Ritschl, "The History of the Filioque Controversy" in Hans Küng and Jürgen Moltmann, eds., *Conflicts About the Holy Spirit* (Concilium, vol. 128; New York: The Seabury Press, 1979), p. 10; Yves Congar, "Classical Political Monotheism and the Trinity", trans. Paul Burns in J.-B. Metz, Edward Schillebeeckx and Marcus Lefébure, eds., *God as Father?* (Concilium, vol. 143; Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark/ New York: The Seabury Press, 1981), pp. 33-34.

²⁵³ Cf. Ritschl, "Filioque Controversy", p. 9.

²⁵⁴ See pp. 38-39.

²⁵⁵ *Ep.* 129.1 (II, 40.7-17; *PG* 32.557C-560A). For the date of the letter, see Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 148.

it was never sent.²⁵⁶ However, there are three significant textual differences between Basil's citation of this passage in his letter to Meletius and the version which appears in those manuscripts which transmit the letter of Apollinaris.²⁵⁷ At least two of these differences indicate that this passage, which, in its original context, endeavours to demonstrate that the persons of the Godhead share the same being,²⁵⁸ has been given "a Sabellian twist".²⁵⁹ Consequently, Basil, an ardent opponent of Sabellianism, was extremely disquieted to find that he himself should be accused of being a follower of the heretic on the basis of such doctored passages.²⁶⁰

However, Basil, in his treatise on the Spirit, did not hesitate to ascribe great importance to one of the Biblical texts included within this incriminating passage, namely 2 Cor 3:17. For Basil, the unequivocal ascription of the title "Lord" to the Holy Spirit in this verse was incontrovertible proof of the Spirit's divine nature.²⁶¹ Yet in an earlier exposition of this text in *Eun.* 3.3, Basil applied it to the Son. This earlier exposition occurs in the midst of Basil's argument for the Spirit's divinity on the basis of the fact that he shares the same names with the Father and Son. He writes:²⁶²

Therefore, if the Spirit's nature is sanctity, like that of the Father and Son, how can he be a third and foreign nature? For it is on account of this, I think, that it was recorded by Isaiah that the Seraphim cried out 'Holy' three times, for the natural sanctity is contemplated in three hypostases. Not only does he share this name of 'holiness' with the Father and Son, but also the title of 'Spirit'. For 'God is a Spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and in truth' [Jn 4:24]. And the prophet says, 'Our Lord Christ is a spirit before our face, of whom we said, In the shadow of his wings we will live' [Lam 4:20]. And the Apostle refers the title of Spirit to the Lord when he says, 'But the Lord is the Spirit' [2 Cor 3:17]. From these [examples] it is in every respect

²⁵⁶ Prestige, *St. Basil*, p. 37. Following the citation, Basil states that although he believes his Pneumatomachian opponents would not hesitate to manufacture such a statement, he is convinced the passage comes from the hand of Apollinaris [*ep.* 129.1 (II, 40.17-31; *PG* 32.560A-B)]. The passage has however been altered in three significant places.

²⁵⁷ For these textual differences, see Prestige, *St. Basil*, p. 33, nn. 4-6; De Riedmatten, "Correspondence", pp. 63-65.

²⁵⁸ Prestige, *St. Basil*, p. 37; K.J. Woollcombe, "Reviews: *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*. By the late G.L. Prestige. Edited from his papers by Henry Chadwick", *JTS*, n.s. IX (1958), 156-157.

²⁵⁹ Woollcombe, "Reviews", p. 156. See also De Riedmatten, "Correspondence", pp. 64-65. Thus, Basil rightly judged the passage to be Sabellian in intent when he wrote in *ep.* 129.1 (II, 40.26-30; *PG* 32.560A-B): "In order to repudiate the accusation of blasphemy which was being circulated against us, and to show to all that we have nothing in common with those who make such a statement, we have been obliged to mention that man [Apollinaris] as one who is approaching the impiety of Sabellius".

²⁶⁰ On Basil's opposition to Sabellianism, see pp. 139-140 and nn. 195, 200.

²⁶¹ Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", p. 354.

²⁶² *PG* 29.660D-661B. See also the discussion by Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", p. 118.

clear that the sharing of names demonstrates not a separation, but a kinship [of the Spirit] with the Father and Son.

The use of the term "Spirit" for the divine nature of the Son has behind it a long history that stretches back to the New Testament itself. This tradition in turn influenced the interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17. For instance, Athanasius regards this verse as a reference to the lordship of the Son.²⁶³ The text of Apollinaris which Basil cites in *ep.* 129 is also, in its own way, a witness to this interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17. Here, in *Eun.* 3.3, Basil adheres to this traditional understanding of the Pauline verse. It had after all the endorsement of a theologian of the stature of Athanasius, whom Basil, on one occasion, addressed as his "spiritual father".²⁶⁴

Yet, as has been mentioned, there is a fundamental shift in Basil's understanding of this text in his later treatise on the Spirit. However, knowledge of what immediately precedes his treatment of 2 Cor 3:17 in *Spir.* 21.52 is indispensable for its proper appreciation. In *Spir.* 19.50, Basil refused to regard the Spirit as a servant, and therefore inferior to the Father,²⁶⁵ with the intent of manoeuvring Eustathius into an affirmation of what the bishop of Caesarea regards as the only other possible alternative: the Spirit belongs to the Godhead. But Eustathius, seeing the dilemma into which he was being forced, interjected the evasive statement that the Spirit is "neither slave nor master, but free".²⁶⁶ The bishop of Sebaste, true to form, sought a middle way out,²⁶⁷ but failed to find one as Basil proceeded to argue that with regard to God all created beings are naturally subservient.²⁶⁸ Yet, Basil felt that more convincing proof of the Spirit's divine nature could be shown from the fact that there are a number of instances in the Scriptures where the Spirit is called "Lord". The fact that Basil might suffer physical harm in presenting these instances is beside the point. Like the martyr Stephen, he was prepared to suffer as a witness to the truth.²⁶⁹

Two texts from the Thessalonian correspondence are first adduced.

²⁶³ *Ar.* 1.11 (*PG* 26.36A). See also Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", pp.353-354. However, see pp. 67-68, n. 60.

²⁶⁴ *Ep.* 82 (I, 185.38; *PG* 32.460C). Cf. the description of Athanasius in *ep.* 66.1-2 (I, 157.25-159.26; *PG* 32.424C-425C).

²⁶⁵ Pp. 101.1-24; *PG* 32.160A-C.

²⁶⁶ P. 102.4-5; *PG* 32.160C. On the meaning and implications of this statement, see Amand de Mendieta, *APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS*, p. 23; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 46; Yamamura, "Development", pp. 13, 15.

²⁶⁷ See p. 27, n. 86.

²⁶⁸ *Spir.* 20.51 (pp. 102.5-103.28; *PG* 32.160C-161C).

²⁶⁹ *Spir.* 21.52 (p.104.4-11; *PG* 32.164A). Basil also compares his position to that of Stephen in *Spir.* 10.25 (p. 58.15-18; *PG* 32.112B).

Due to the explicit reference to both the Father and the Son in 2 Thes 3:5 and 1 Thes 3:12-13, Basil reasons that the “Lord” of whom these texts also speak must be the Spirit. Saving the best to last, Basil then turns to 2 Cor 3:17-18. He writes:²⁷⁰

Let them listen to yet another testimony which distinctly calls the Spirit ‘Lord’. It says, ‘Now the Lord is the Spirit’ and again, ‘Just as from the Lord the Spirit’ [2 Cor 3:17,18]. But in order to leave no room for dispute, I will present the [entire] text of the Apostle: ‘For until today at the reading of the Old Testament the same veil remains unlifted, because it is removed in Christ. But whenever a man turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit’ [2 Cor 3:14,16-17]. Why does he say this? Because the one who devotes himself to the mere sense of the letter, and who occupies himself with the legal observances there has his heart completely veiled as it were by the literalistic interpretation of the Jews. This [devotion to the letter] occurs because he is unaware that the external observance of the law is removed at the coming of Christ; since then, the types have been transformed into reality. For lamps become useless when the sun appears; and after the truth has appeared the law ceases and the prophets are silenced.

However, the one who has been empowered to peer into the depth of the meaning of the law and who passes through the obscurity of the letter, as through a veil, enters into ineffable truths. Such a person is an imitator of Moses, who removed his veil when he spoke with God, for he also turned from the letter to the Spirit. Thus, the obscurity of the teachings of the law corresponds to the veil over the face of Moses and the spiritual contemplation to the turning to the Lord. Consequently, he who takes away the letter when he reads the law and turns to the Lord (and ‘the Lord’ means the Spirit here) becomes like Moses, whose face was glorified when God appeared [to him]. Just as objects which are exposed to brilliant colours are themselves coloured by the light which streams [from those colours], so the one who gazes intently upon the Spirit is somehow transformed by the glory of the Spirit into something even more radiant, and his heart is illuminated by the truth which comes from the Spirit, as it were by a light. This is the transformation from the glory of the Spirit into his own glory [cf. 2 Cor 3:18]. [This transformation occurs to a degree which is] neither parsimonious nor indistinct, but to such a degree as the one who has been illumined by the Spirit is capable.

Man, are you not ashamed, when the Apostle states that ‘You are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwells in you’ [1 Cor 3:16]? Would he ever have consented to honouring the dwelling of a slave with the title of temple? Moreover, surely the one who calls the Scripture ‘divinely inspired’ [cf. 2 Tim 3:16], since it was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, could not use the expressions of one who insults and belittles the Spirit.

Basil regards 2 Cor 3:17-18 as an unequivocal declaration of the Spirit’s divine nature. This interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17-18 is guided by the view that there exists a fundamental ontological divide between God and the created realm, which can be expressed by the contrast “master” (δεσπότης) — “servant” (δοῦλος).²⁷¹ For Basil, unlike Eustathius, did not believe

²⁷⁰ *Spir.* 21.52 (pp.105.12-106.28; *PG* 32.164C-165C).

²⁷¹ Holl, *Amphilochius*, pp. 127-128.

that there is an intermediate being between these two poles. Thus, when Scripture (2 Cor 3:17-18, as well as 2 Thes 3:5 and 1 Thes 3:12-13) names the Spirit as “Lord” (κύριος), which Basil obviously regards as a synonym for “master”, Scripture attests to the fact that the Spirit is divine, and neither an intermediate being nor a creature.²⁷²

Yet, how is this shift in interpretation from *Eun.* 3.3 to be explained? The obvious answer is that it simply reflects the change in the historical circumstances.²⁷³ This is partly true, for Basil did have a knack for adapting himself to his audience and circumstances. This adaptability need not imply that Basil was capricious. Rather, it means that he always took account of his audience and circumstances and made them the starting-point for his reflections. Another answer may lie in the fact that the forms of argumentation employed in the controversy over the Spirit were often identical to those that had been forged in the debate over the Son.²⁷⁴ The awareness that 2 Cor 3:17-18 could be understood as a christological as well as a pneumatological affirmation is possibly present in Basil’s statement: “but in order to leave no room for dispute, I will present the [entire] text of the Apostle”. If so, the exposition that follows this citation indicates that Basil regards his pneumatological interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17-18 in *Spir.* 21.52 as definitive.

This exposition, which is clearly influenced by Origen’s treatment of the same passage in, for example, *princ.* 1.1.2²⁷⁵ and *Cels.* 5.60,²⁷⁶ nonetheless differs from that of Origen in one fundamental aspect. For Origen the removal of the veil, which he usually understands to be a designation of the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, opens up the way for the believer’s contemplation of the spiritual truths which lie hidden beneath the Scriptural text.²⁷⁷ But for Basil, the lifting of the veil means that the believer is brought face to face with the Lord himself, that is, the Spirit.²⁷⁸ The delineation of the results of this encounter for the

²⁷² Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, p. 46. Gribomont (“Origenisme”, p. 281), notes that Basil inherited this contrast from Gregory Thaumaturgus. See also Verhees, “Transzendenz”, p. 289 and n.17; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 3.

²⁷³ Gribomont, “Paulinisme”, p. 486. Cf. Athanasius’ judgment, pp. 32-33 above.

²⁷⁴ Pelikan, “Spiritual Sense”, pp. 344-346.

²⁷⁵ Pp. 92.44-94.62; *PG* 11.122B-C.

²⁷⁶ Pp. 162-164; *PG* 11.1276C-D. Pruche (*Saint-Esprit*, pp. 436-437, n.3) believes that Basil may have employed *Cels.* 6.70 (pp. 352-356; *PG* 11.1404B-1405B) as a basis for his exposition of 2 Cor 3:17-18. But, apart from the citation of this text, Origen’s discussion in *Cels.* 6.70 has little in common with that of Basil in *Spir.* 21.52.

²⁷⁷ Henri Crouzel, *Théologie de l’image de Dieu chez Origène* (Théologie, vol. 34; [Paris]: Aubier, 1956), pp. 232-236. See also *idem*, *Connaissance*, pp. 282-283, 325-330, 362-363.

²⁷⁸ Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 67 and n. 1; Pruche, *Saint-Esprit*, pp. 436-437, n. 3.

believer here in *Spir.* 21 recalls the description given in *Spir.* 9.23. There, Basil writes:²⁷⁹

Just as when the sun's ray falls on bright and transparent objects, and they themselves become brilliant and a further light radiates from them, so those souls who bear the Spirit and who are illuminated by him, are themselves rendered spiritual and send forth their grace to others.

Both this text and that from *Spir.* 21.52 emphasize that the believer who fixes his gaze intently upon the Holy Spirit is not only irradiated by the glory of that Spirit, but also becomes, as it were, a reflector for the Spirit's glory. In *Spir.* 21.52 the phrase "from glory to glory" (2 Cor 3:18) is regarded as an indication of this transformation. A similar interpretation of 2 Cor 3:18 occurs in *hom. in Ps.* 29.7 apropos of Ps 29:13.

Since the Apostle 'with face unveiled is transformed into his image from glory to glory' [2 Cor 3:18], he calls the grace given to him from the Lord his own glory. 'That my glory may shine to you' [Ps 29:13]. The glory of a righteous man is the Spirit which is in him.²⁸⁰

Basil understands 2 Cor 3:18 in both this text and *Spir.* 21.52 as an affirmation of the believer's participation in the divine glory of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, despite the fact that the believer who is transformed by the Spirit becomes a "spiritual person" who is able to act as a "reflector" of the Spirit's glory and who is able to call the glory which "shines out" from him his own, it is never forgotten that this glory is derived from the Spirit within him.²⁸¹

A central motif within this exposition of 2 Cor 3:14-17 is that the divinity of the Spirit is revealed by the way in which he transforms believers. In a manner which is neither stingy nor obscure, but which can only be characterized as royal, the Spirit imparts to believers his glory which leads to their transformation into spiritual persons. This argument for the Spirit's divinity from his activities also governs Basil's interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17 in *Spir.* 24.55. Basil writes:²⁸²

Where then will we take the Spirit and place him? With creation? But the whole of creation is in bondage whereas the Spirit sets free: 'Where the Spirit of the Lord, there is freedom' [2 Cor 3:17].

²⁷⁹ P. 53.16-21; PG 32.109 B-C. See also the discussion of this description by Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 153.

²⁸⁰ PG 29.321C-D.

²⁸¹ Basil thus understands Paul's text along the lines of Origen. See Marguerite Harl, "'From Glory to Glory'. L'interprétation de II Cor. 3,18b par Grégoire de Nysse et la liturgie baptismale" in Granfield and Jungmann, eds., *Kyriakon*, II, 730-735.

²⁸² P. 111. 16-18; PG 32.172B.

Verhees²⁸³ draws attention to the apparent contradiction which lies at the root of this argument for the Spirit's divinity. The creature, though freed from bondage by the Spirit, does not thereby cease to be a servant. But, Verhees asks, if the creature is essentially a servant (as Basil argues in *Spir.* 20.51), how can the creature be freed from this state? Clearly, Basil does not understand the term "in bondage to" to be simply a synonym for "subordinate to" or a characteristic of every created nature. Verhees finds the answer to his question in *hom. in Ps.* 48.3, 8-9,²⁸⁴ where Basil is explicit about the bondage from which fallen men and women are freed. According to this homily, fallen human beings are slaves of the devil, sin, and undisciplined lust. Through Christ (the Spirit is not named in this context) fallen men and women are freed from these forces of bondage. That this function is ascribed to the Spirit in *Spir.* 24.55 apropos of 2 Cor 3:17 indicates that he must be regarded as on the same level as Christ.

Spir. 21.52 closes with the citation of 1 Cor 3:16 and an allusion to 2 Tim 3:16. Both of these references are intended to provide, as it were, a summary of Basil's argument in this section. With the citation of 1 Cor 3:16, Basil picks up the theme which guided his thought at the beginning of the section: the language which Scripture uses of the Spirit is that which befits divinity. 2 Thes 3:5, 1 Thes 3:12-13 and especially 2 Cor 3:17-18 provide unequivocal confirmation of this point, for they call the Spirit "Lord". Here, in 1 Cor 3:16, the description of the Spirit is not as clear, but just as decisive when properly understood. It would be the height of folly to designate the habitation of a slave "a temple". Therefore, when Scripture calls the believers at Corinth the temple of the Spirit of God, the Spirit's true dignity is thereby indicated.²⁸⁵ The allusion to 2 Tim 3:16 sums up the second half of this section, which is devoted to an exposition of 2 Cor 3:14-17. Scripture is divinely inspired, that is, it was written under the direction of the Holy Spirit.²⁸⁶ Since this is the case, the reading of and the meditation upon the Scriptures entails an encounter with their author, namely the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, from his exposition of 2 Cor 3:14-17 Basil concluded that this encounter involves a transformation, whereby the reader becomes a spiritual person, one who is filled with the glory of the Spirit himself and who is

²⁸³ "Transzendenz", pp. 296-297.

²⁸⁴ *PG* 29.437B-440B, 449B-453C.

²⁸⁵ On a later allusion to 1 Cor 3:16 in *Spir.*, see pp. 164-166.

²⁸⁶ This belief in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures is frequently indicated by Basil's reference to them as the "sayings of the Spirit". See, for example, *opp.* 204.5 (II, 177.23-24; *PG* 32.752A); 261.3 (III, 118.29; *PG* 32.972C); *hex.* 4.1 (p.246.7; *PG* 29.80B); 9.1 (p.482.6-7, 13-14; *PG* 29.189A, A-B). See also Scazzoso, "Sacra Scrittura", pp. 212-214.

enabled to think properly about the doctrine of the Spirit.²⁸⁷ But to characterize the Spirit as anything less than divine not only belittles him, but also calls into question both his inspiration of the Scriptures and the Spirit's transforming activity which is conducted through meditation upon the sacred text.²⁸⁸

8. *The Spirit in the Doxology*

Throughout his treatise on the Holy Spirit, Basil never loses sight of the very practical question which had provided the immediate occasion for its composition, namely which is a more appropriate doxology: "glory to the Father with the Son together with the Holy Spirit" or "glory to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit"?²⁸⁹ In fact, this question is the high-point in the struggle between Basil and the Pneumatomachi led by Eustathius. For these doxologies are, as it were, concise statements of the respective views held by Basil and his opponents with regard to the status and nature of the Holy Spirit.²⁹⁰ For Basil, the Spirit is indivisible from the Father and the Son, since he possesses a nature which is identical to theirs. Consequently, Basil believes that the Spirit has to be glorified together with the Father and the Son.²⁹¹ This belief does not mean that the second doxology is to be discarded, for it too has its place in the worship of the Christian community, as Basil intends to demonstrate.

However, Eustathius thought otherwise. He held that the Spirit has a nature which is inferior to that of the Father and the Son and thus it was improper to rank him alongside the Father and the Son in the doxology.²⁹² 1 Tim 5:21, an instance where creatures, namely angels, are mentioned together with the Father and the Son, was offered as proof of his position. Just as the inclusion of the angels alongside the Father and the Son in this passage has not led the Church to ascribe to them the same glory as is given to the Father and the Son, so the mention of the Spirit together with

²⁸⁷ Cf. Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", p. 340.

²⁸⁸ See the comments by Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 151-152; Scazzoso, "Sacra Scrittura", pp. 222-223 and n. 56. Cf. also Gregory of Nazianzus' statement in *or.* 31.21 (p. 316.5-8; *PG* 36.156C-D) about authors of his own day who, with regard to the doctrine of the Spirit, "have studied the holy Scriptures, neither carelessly nor cursorily, but have opened up the letter [of Scripture] and looked deeply into [what lies] within. And they have been counted worthy to see the beauty which is hidden there and have been illuminated by the light of knowledge".

²⁸⁹ For the historical circumstances surrounding the composition of *Spir.*, see pp. 43-45.

²⁹⁰ Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 50.

²⁹¹ See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 134-144.

²⁹² *Spir.* 10.24 (pp. 56.1-57.2; *PG* 32.109D). See Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 44, 50-51.

the Father and the Son need not imply that he is to be glorified with them.²⁹³ But later, when Basil demonstrates from Scripture that such diverse objects as men (Ps 8:5), heavenly bodies (1 Cor 15:41),²⁹⁴ and the old and new covenants (2 Cor 3:7-9) are all said to be glorified, Eustathius concedes:²⁹⁵

[Very well, then] let him be glorified, but not with (μετά) the Father and Son.

Apparently Eustathius had begun by refusing to ascribe any glory to the Spirit,²⁹⁶ but in the course of his discussion with Basil he was forced, as this passage shows, to give way on this point.²⁹⁷ Hauschild surmises that Eustathius may have realized that absolute refusal to ascribe any glory to the Spirit would mean that the Spirit was unequivocally ranked among the creatures, a view to which he did not wish to subscribe.²⁹⁸ Be this as it may, Eustathius remained adamant in *Spir.* 24.55 that the glorification of the Spirit should not be equal to that of the Father and the Son. In fact, at a later juncture in his discussion with Basil, Eustathius maintained that there is no Scriptural warrant for describing the Spirit as glorified together with the Father and the Son.²⁹⁹ If one is to follow Scriptural usage, then glory shall be ascribed to the Father through the Son “in (ἐν) the Holy Spirit”.³⁰⁰ As Hauschild has pointed out,³⁰¹ this defence of the preposition “in” with regard to the Holy Spirit is rooted in Eustathius’ belief that there is a fundamental divide between God and the Spirit. The Spirit is, as it were, simply the power in which the Christian worships.

To Eustathius’ “proof from the Scriptures” Basil has a two-fold reply. In the first place, he is not at all convinced that the preposition “in”, when employed in relation to the Spirit in the doxology, implies that the Spirit’s nature is inferior to that of the Father and the Son. In fact, the most sublime meanings come to light when the implications behind this

²⁹³ *Spir.* 13.29 (p. 65.7-13; *PG* 32.117C). See Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 44-45.

²⁹⁴ On Basil’s interpretation of 1 Cor 15:41, see François Altermath, *Du corps psychique au corps spirituel. Interprétation de 1 Cor.15, 35-49 par les auteurs chrétiens des quatre premiers siècles* [Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, no. 18; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1977], pp. 172-173.

²⁹⁵ *Spir.* 24.55 (pp. 110.6-111.2; *PG* 32.169C-172A).

²⁹⁶ *Spir.* 19.48 (p. 96.19-21; *PG* 32.156A).

²⁹⁷ Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, p. 52.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

²⁹⁹ *Spir.* 24.58 (p. 113.22-24; *PG* 32.173C). Cf. *Spir.* 27.67 (p. 133.9-12; *PG* 32.193A); 27.68 (p.134.14-16; *PG* 32.193D-196A); 29.71 (p. 138.4-5; *PG* 32.200B). See also the discussion by Amand de Mendieta, *APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS*, pp. 33-34, 64-66.

³⁰⁰ *Spir.* 24.58 (p. 113.24-25; *PG* 32.173C).

³⁰¹ “Pneumatomachen” p. 52.

preposition are properly understood.³⁰² Second, Basil knows of no place in Scripture where the doxology championed by the Pneumatomachi is actually found. To be sure, each of the clauses within this doxology can be found in the Scriptures but there is no instance where they appear together in the precise conformation “glory to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit”.³⁰³ After a short defence of the phrase “with (σύν) the Holy Spirit”,³⁰⁴ to which Basil will return in later sections,³⁰⁵ the bishop of Caesarea provides an elaboration on his comment about the preposition “in”. When he is through, he warns his opponents, he will not be surprised if they regard this preposition as a traitor to their cause!³⁰⁶

A knowledge of all of the various ways in which the preposition “in” is employed provides aid in the formation of sound concepts regarding the Spirit. Take for instance, the fact that power is said to dwell in its recipient, of which a particular example is the power to see in a healthy eye. So the Spirit is said to be active “in” the purified soul, as for example, when the Apostle Paul prays that the eyes of the Ephesians might be enlightened by the Spirit of wisdom (cf. Eph 1:17-18).³⁰⁷ Another example is the distribution of the spiritual gifts, a prominent theme in 1 Cor 12.

Moreover with regard to the distribution of the spiritual gifts, the Spirit is conceived of as a whole in parts. For ‘we are all members of one another, having gifts that differ according to the grace of God which is given to us’ [Rom 12:5,6]. For this reason ‘the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of you, nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you’ [1 Cor 12:21]. On the contrary, all the members together complete the body of Christ in the unity of the Spirit, and render to one another the indispensable help that comes from the spiritual gifts. ‘For God has arranged the members in the body, each one of them, as he chose’ [1 Cor 12:18] so that ‘the members might have the same care for one another’ [1 Cor 12:25] according to the spiritual communion of their innate sympathetic affection. Therefore, ‘if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; if one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it’ [1 Cor 12:26]. And as a part in a whole, so each of us in the Spirit, for ‘we were all baptized in one body into one Spirit’ [1 Cor 12:13].³⁰⁸

Since the being of the Holy Spirit is simple and indivisible,³⁰⁹ in the distribution of the spiritual gifts his activity must be understood as that of one who, in the words of *Spir.* 9.22, “is wholly present in each [of the

³⁰² *Spir.* 25.58 (p. 114.1-9; PG 32.173D-176A).

³⁰³ *Spir.* 25.58 (p. 114.9-20; PG 32.176A-B). See also Johnston, *Holy Spirit*, p. 114, n.16.

³⁰⁴ *Spir.* 25.59-60 (pp. 114.24-117.18; PG 32.176B-180A).

³⁰⁵ *Spir.* 27.68-29.75 (pp. 134.14-149.25; PG 32.193D-209D).

³⁰⁶ *Spir.* 25.60 (p.117.25-28; PG 32.180A-B).

³⁰⁷ *Spir.* 26.61 (p. 118.4-9,15-19; PG 32.180B,C).

³⁰⁸ *Spir.* 26.61 (pp. 119.20-120.5; PG 32.181A-C).

³⁰⁹ *Spir.* 9.22 (pp. 51.3-5, 52.16; PG 32.108A-B,C).

spiritual gifts]”.³¹⁰ Rom 12:5-6, a description of the manifold nature of the gifts bestowed upon the Church by the one Holy Spirit, is cited as support for this statement. The passage which follows the citation of Rom 12:5-6, up to and including the citation of 1 Cor 12:26, is actually a small digression on a theme dear to Basil’s heart: the glory of communal Christianity.³¹¹ Basil’s final comment in *Spir.* 26.61 links this digression to the statement with which the passage began, namely, the Spirit is wholly present in each of the spiritual gifts. The digression on the glory of communal Christianity focused on the fact that the members of the body of Christ, though diverse in function, are one in the Spirit. Since this is the case, the relationship of each member of the body of Christ to the Spirit can now be likened to that of a part in a whole. This point is reinforced by the concluding citation from 1 Cor 12:13, which contrasts the many members with the “one body” and the “one Spirit”.

Basil’s investigation of the sublime meanings of the preposition “in” continues in *Spir.* 26.62.³¹²

It is a paradoxical statement but nonetheless true, that the Spirit is often designated as the place of those who are being sanctified (χώρα τῶν ἁγιαζομένων). Moreover, it will become clear that this metaphor does not belittle the Spirit, but rather glorifies him. For the Scripture frequently applies corporeal terms to spiritual concepts for the sake of clarity. Consequently, I have noticed that the Psalmist even says with regard to God: ‘Be to me a protector God and a strong place to save me’ [Ps 70:3 (LXX)]. And with regard to the Spirit, it is said, ‘Behold, there is a place (τόπος) by me, stand there upon the rock’ [Ex 33:21]. What other place is meant than the contemplation in the Spirit, for when Moses was there he was able to see God clearly manifested to him. This is the proper place of true worship. For it says, ‘Be careful that you do not offer your burnt offerings in every place, but [only] in the place which the Lord your God will choose’ [Dt 12:13-14]. Now what is a spiritual burnt offering? The sacrifice of praise [cf. Ps 50:14]. And in what place do we offer it? In (ἐν) the Holy Spirit. Where have we learned this? From the Lord himself, when he says, ‘The true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit, and in truth’ [Jn 4:23]. When Jacob saw this place he said, ‘The Lord is in this place’ [Gen 28:16]. Thus the Spirit is truly the place of the saints and the saint is a proper place for the Spirit, since he offers himself as an indwelling for God and is called his temple [cf. 1 Cor 3:16]. For as Paul speaks in Christ saying, ‘In the sight of God we speak in Christ’ [2 Cor 2:17], and Christ in Paul, as he himself says, ‘Do you seek a proof that Christ speaks in me?’ [2 Cor 13:3], so also he speaks mysteries in the Spirit [1 Cor 14:2], and the Spirit, in turn, speaks in him.

³¹⁰ P.52.17; PG 32.108C. See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 55, 147-148.

³¹¹ For perhaps the clearest exposition of Basil’s concept of communal Christianity, see *reg. fus.* 7.2 (PG 31.929C-932B). On this passage, see Clarke, *Ascetic Works*, pp. 44-45; Fedwick, *Charisma*, pp. 20-22.

³¹² Pp. 120.6-121.15; PG 32.181C-184A.

This section opens on a bold note: the Spirit is, according to Basil, often referred to as the “place” (χώρα) of sanctification. Yet, in the discussion which follows, the term χώρα fails to appear. Instead, Basil employs the word τόπος, which he apparently regards as an equivalent term. The reason for the change is obvious: χώρα does not appear in those Scriptures which Basil adduces in support of his statement, whereas τόπος does.³¹³ Now this claim about the Spirit is a bold one, for Basil, on the basis of Jn 4:24, had asserted in *Spir.* 9.22 that it was an error on the part of the Samaritan woman to believe that God could be worshipped in a set geographical location, because God is not spatially limited.³¹⁴ This earlier point has not been forgotten. Thus, Basil states that a correct understanding of this metaphor actually leads, not to the belittling of the Spirit, but to his glorification. The citation from Ps 71:3 reinforces Basil’s point: even God can be described in such physical terms. In the exposition which follows, Basil indicates what the correct understanding of this metaphor involves.

Moses, according to Basil, was able to receive a clear manifestation of God when he stood in the proper place for contemplation, that is, when he was “in the Spirit”. But, not only is it “in the Spirit” that one contemplates God, but that is also the place where one offers true worship to him, as Dt 12:13-14 testifies. The sacrifice mentioned in this Old Testament passage is interpreted by Basil as a reference to the sacrifice of praise offered by the Church to God. And what makes this sacrifice of praise efficacious is that it is offered in the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the Lord’s own statement in Jn 4:23 is the source for this designation of the Spirit as the place of contemplation and worship.³¹⁵

Here, Basil employs the results obtained from his prepositional exegesis of 1 Cor 12:3 in *Spir.* 18.47.³¹⁶ There, Basil concluded from the use of the phrase “in the Holy Spirit” in 1 Cor 12:3 that it is only the presence of the Spirit that enables the believer to contemplate the Son and receive true knowledge about him. In this passage, the same point is made apropos of Ex 33:21, and by means of Dt 12:13-14 and Jn 4:23 extended to worship: only “in the Spirit” is true worship possible.³¹⁷

³¹³ M.A. Donovan, “The Spirit, Place of the Sanctified” (Unpublished paper, 1979), p. 14, n. 10.

³¹⁴ P 51.5-7; PG 32.108A-B.

³¹⁵ Cf. the exposition of Jn 4:24 in *Spir.* 26.64 (pp. 123.10124.2; PG 32.185A-C). On Athanasius’ interpretation of the same text, see p. 103.

³¹⁶ See pp. 125-129.

³¹⁷ According to Boris Bobrinskoy [“Liturgie et ecclésiologie trinitaire de saint Basile”, VC, LXXXIX (1969), 14-15, 20], this passage has an indubitable eucharistic stamp, even though Basil does not provide a systematic treatment of the specific role of the Spirit in the

In a sense, the proper conclusion to this passage is given in the clause: “thus the Spirit is truly the place of the saints”. The saints, those who are being sanctified by the Spirit, are able to engage in the contemplation and worship of the Godhead regardless of their “position in life” or their geographical location.³¹⁸ But just as in *Spir.* 26.61, where the converse of the statement “the Spirit is conceived of as a whole in parts” was found to be true, so it is the case here. Not only is the Spirit the place of the saints, but the saint can also be described as the place of the Spirit, as the allusion to 1 Cor 3:16 demonstrates. This text describes the believer as a temple of God and was an important text in Basil’s earlier refutation of Eunomius’ assertion that the Spirit is a creature of the Son and lacks a divine nature.³¹⁹

The one who says this [the Spirit is a creature of the Son] does not seem to have believed that the Godhead dwells in us, as... the Apostle says, ‘Do you not know that you are the temple of God and the Holy Spirit dwells in you?’ [1 Cor 3:16]. And again, ‘In him the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit’ [Eph 2:21-22]. Therefore, if it says God dwells in us through the Spirit, is it not clearly impious to say that this very Spirit does not partake of deity? And if we call gods those who are perfect in virtue, which perfection [is given] through the Spirit, how does he, who is lacking in deity, divinize others?³²⁰

Here the argument focuses on the activity of the Spirit: since he fashions believers into a temple for God to dwell in and in so doing divinizes them, he must partake of that which he gives.³²¹ A similar point is implied in the allusion to 1 Cor 3:16 in *Spir.* 26.62. The saint, the one who is being sanctified, is the place where the Spirit is especially active. Underlying both of these treatments of 1 Cor 3:16 is Basil’s belief that it is only through the Spirit that God’s saving work (sanctification) is accomplished and that it is through sanctification that the Spirit enables man

eucharist. Other scholars, however, do not seem to regard this passage as eucharistic in intent, for they speak of Basil’s silence with regard to the Spirit’s activity in the eucharist. See Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 183-184; Orphanos, *Creation and Salvation*, p. 123; J.H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit. The eucharistic epiclesis in twentieth century theology (1900-1966)* (Alcuin Club Collections, no. 57; Great Wakering, Essex: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975), pp. 53-54. In any case, all would agree that Basil, like his orthodox contemporaries, never argues for the Spirit’s divinity on the basis of a Spirit epiclesis in the eucharist. Instead, he focuses on the fact that it is only through the presence of the Spirit that contemplation and worship of God are possible.

³¹⁸ Letter received from P.J. Fedwick (June 19, 1981). Cf. also his *Charisma*, p. 31.

³¹⁹ Cf. pp. 158-159.

³²⁰ *Eun.* 3.5 (PG 29.665B).

³²¹ See Melcher, *Der 8. Brief*, p. 45 and n. 7; Heising, “Der Heilige Geist”, pp. 285-286; Barmann, “Cappadocian Triumph”, p. 119.

to reach the goal of his existence: "to become God" (θεὸν γενέσθαι).³²²

Moreover this belief is firmly wedded to Basil's concept of the way in which the Spirit leads men to the knowledge of God. The Spirit sanctifies the soul in which he dwells, enabling that soul to see in him both the Son and the Father.³²³ And just as the knowledge of the Father and the Son is not given without the presence of the Spirit, so the Spirit's sanctification of the believer is not executed apart from the Father and the Son. For nothing can divide the eternal union which exists between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. As Basil states in *hom.* 24.5:³²⁴

Where the Holy Spirit is present, there Christ also dwells; and where Christ is, it is clear that the Father is also present there. 'Do you not know that your bodies are a temple of the Holy Spirit in you?' [1 Cor 6:19]. And 'if someone destroys the temple of God, him will God destroy' [1 Cor 3:17]. Therefore, when we are sanctified by the Spirit we receive Christ who dwells in our inner man and with Christ [comes] the Father, making those who are worthy their common dwelling.

The aim of Basil's exegesis of these Scriptural texts in *Spir.* 26.62 is to demonstrate that the use of the preposition "in" with regard to the Spirit in the doxology championed by the Pneumatomachi does not imply that he is inferior to the Father and the Son. But his analysis of that doxology in which this preposition occurs does show that it is an appropriate confession of human weakness.³²⁵ For it is only in the Spirit, "the place of the saints", that one can glorify the Father and the Son (Dt 12:13-14; Jn 4:23). The results of Basil's exegesis of 1 Cor 12:3 enable him to establish this point. And it is only because the Spirit indwells and sanctifies the believer (1 Cor 3:16) that the believer, "the place of the Spirit", is able to offer the doxology to God.³²⁶ Thus, he concludes:³²⁷

³²² *Spir.* 9.23 (p. 54.4 ; *PG* 32.109C). That Basil's concept of sanctification has a prominent ethical character is well illustrated by his allusion to 1 Cor 3:16 in *hom.* 2.7 (*PG* 21.196C), given in Lent of 371: 'What does fasting have in common with drunkenness? What fellowship has debauchery with self-control? 'What agreement has the temple of God with idols?' [2 Cor 6:16] For those in whom the Spirit of God dwells are a temple of God [cf. 1 Cor 3:16], but those who through drunkenness accept the refuse of licentiousness are a temple of idols." See also Verhees, "Transzendenz", pp. 299-300. On Basil's conception of the Spirit's role in sanctification, see Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 153; Heising, "Der Heilige Geist", *passim*; Verhees, "Transzendenz", pp. 299-302; Hauschild, "Basilius von Caesarea", p. 309.

³²³ Verhees, "Transzendenz", p. 300.

³²⁴ *PG* 31.609C-D. See also Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 95, 157.

³²⁵ *Spir.* 26.63 (p. 122.21-26; *PG* 32.184C).

³²⁶ *Spir.* 26.63 (pp. 122.26-123.9; *PG* 32.184C-185A). See also the statement of Donovan ("Spirit", p. 10): the Spirit's "rank is so far beyond humankind's ability even to praise that for us to worship Him is itself His gift. He takes us 'in himself' to enable us to worship at all".

³²⁷ *Spir.* 26.63 (pp. 121.16-122.8, 18-21; *PG* 32.184A-B,C). See also Pelikan, "Spiritual Sense", p. 349 ; Donovan, "Spirit", pp. 9-11.

Therefore, with regard to created beings, the Spirit is said to be in (ἐνεῖναι) them in many and various ways. But with regard to the Father and Son, it is more consistent with true piety to say that he is with (συνεῖναι) them, rather than in them. For the grace which comes from him, when he dwells in those who are worthy and accomplishes his activities, is well described as existing in those that are able to receive him. However, the contemplation of the [Spirit's] eternal existence and permanent presence with the Son and Father requires terms [which express] everlasting union. For proper and true coexistence is predicated of those beings who exist with one another in an inseparable manner.

9. Summary

Embedded within *Spir.* 9, that tranquil meditation on the Spirit, are three closely related themes which provide a positive statement of Basil's pneumatological thought. The Spirit must be considered as divine since: 1) the names which are used to describe him in the Scriptures indicate one of glorious majesty; 2) the activities which are assigned to him by the Scriptures could only be ascribed to one who is divine, especially the fact that he sanctifies the soul within which he dwells; and 3) the fact that he reveals to the purified soul the Son and in the Son, as in an image, the Father. By no means however, are these the only themes around which Basil builds his doctrine of the Spirit. For instance, there is no mention of baptism in *Spir.* 9, although the role of the Spirit in baptism is of great significance for Basil. Basil's thoughts about this role are well illustrated by his exegesis of 1 Cor 10:2.

Just as Athanasius had to devote a considerable section of *ep. Serap.* 1 to the refutation of his opponents' interpretation of Am 4:13 and 1 Tim 5:21, so Basil has to provide an extensive reply to Eustathius' use of 1 Cor 10:2. Although this reply has much in common with the traditional interpretation of this verse, it is Basil's baptismal theology that plays the decisive role in his interpretation of the verse. Basil believes that the "real presence" of the Holy Spirit in the waters of baptism imparts new life to the soul that is enslaved by sin and the devil. Consequently, Christian baptism is incomparably superior to that baptism which the Israelites under Moses' leadership experienced during their crossing of the Red Sea; for Moses was a creature, unable to impart to his fellow creatures any spiritual gift. But the benefits which attend Christian baptism indicate that the Spirit is not a creature like Moses, but one who "forms an essential part of the divine and blessed Trinity".³²⁸

³²⁸ *Hex.* 2. 6 (p. 168.1-2; *PG* 29.44A). Cf. *epp.* 140.2 (II, 62.32; *PG* 32.589A); 243.4 (III, 72.19-25; *PG* 32.909A).

This argument for the Spirit's divinity from his activities also looms large in Basil's exposition of 1 Cor 12:3 and 2:10. The Spirit enables both humanity and angels to recognize the true identity of Christ as God (1 Cor 12:3), to have insight into divine mysteries (1 Cor 2:10), and to offer true worship to God (1 Cor 12:3). But the recognition of who Christ is and the knowledge of divine mysteries cannot be disclosed to creatures by a fellow creature, but must come from God himself. For between God and the created order there exists a fundamental divide that can only be bridged from God's side. Moreover, the ability of men and women and angels to abide in God and sing his praises comes from the Spirit. According to Basil, this fact is clearly exhibited by the conduct of the fallen angels, who turned away from God and who can utter the statement "Jesus is anathema" (1 Cor 12:3). Without the presence of the Spirit, chaos would reign among the angels and in the Church, and none would remain true to God.

As it is, the Spirit produces and preserves order in the Church through the distribution of the spiritual gifts "as he wills" (1 Cor 12:11). Such an activity, one that is natural to a lord, differentiates him from the creatures, whose activity is always characterized by servanthood. Here, the crucial axiom of Cappadocian theology comes into play: within the universe there are basically two types of entities, which can be characterized as "Lord" and "servant". In the true sense of the term, only God is Lord. That the Spirit naturally acts as Lord thus indicates his divinity.³²⁹ Proof that the Spirit's lordship, hence his divinity, is recognized by the Scriptures is afforded by 2 Cor 3:17-18, where the Spirit is named as Lord, and, in a more allusive manner, by 1 Cor 3:16, where the believer who is indwelt by the Spirit is called a temple of God. Yet, both of these texts also describe activities of the Spirit, which are radically different from those engaged in by created beings. 1 Cor 3:16 indicates that the saint is the "proper place for the Spirit". In other words, the Spirit, whose distinctive attribute is that of sanctifying power, transforms the believer into a temple of God, where God can be properly contemplated and worshipped. 2 Cor 3:17-18, and the verses immediately preceding it, indicate that the purified soul who rivets his attention on the Spirit becomes like a transparent and shiny object beneath sunlight: he is irradiated by the Spirit's glory and becomes a "reflector", as it were, of the Spirit. It is characteristic of Basil's biblicism that he sees this

³²⁹ On the "royal freedom" of the Spirit, see also Torrance, "Spiritus Creator", p. 223.

transformation occurring, at least in part, as the believer searches the Scriptures.

This transformation of the purified soul, which reveals the Spirit's divinity, is intimately wedded to another theme that is dear to Basil, that of image theology: the Spirit illumines the purified soul, enabling him to contemplate the Son, and in the contemplation of the Son, to ascend to the vision of the Father. This "ladder of revelation", a concise summary of the doctrine Basil exhorts his monks to protect against the attacks of the Pneumatomachi,³³⁰ determines the exegesis of both 1 Cor 12:3 and 1 Cor 12:4-6. In the exposition of 1 Cor 12:3, Basil draws out the implications of the preposition "in" for the Spirit's divinity. The Spirit enables the purified soul to know the Son since he is inseparable from the Son and unveils the glory of the Son within himself. In his interpretation of 1 Cor 12:4-6, Basil assures his readers that this conception of the way God reveals himself does not mean that the Spirit is to be regarded as logically prior to either the Son or the Father. For the order of the persons of the Godhead given in the baptismal formula of Mt 28:19 is the proper order for the Church's confession of faith and doxology. 1 Cor 12:4-6 describes the way in which the believer experiences God. Nonetheless, this "ladder of revelation" cannot be regarded simply as a product of Basil's own experience. Basil's firm belief in the monarchy of the Father, that the divine characteristics of the Godhead extend from the Father through the Son to the Spirit, undergirds his belief about the way in which the purified soul comes to know God.

On the other hand, it was Basil's concrete experience of the Spirit's activity in his own life that led him to emphasize the differences between the persons of the Godhead.³³¹ Although he was not prepared to coin a special term such as "procession" in order to delineate the Spirit's mode of existence,³³² he did distinguish the Spirit from the Father and the Son by stating that the Spirit proceeds from God the Father as the breath of his mouth (Jn 15:26; 1 Cor 2:12; Ps 33:6). This description was clear enough to indicate the natural community of being that existed between the Father and the Spirit, and, by inference, the Son, as well as ambiguous enough to preserve the ultimately ineffable nature of the Spirit's existence.

³³⁰ *Ep.* 226.3 (III, 27.28-36; *PG* 32.848C-849A). See also Dörries, "Basilius", p. 135.

³³¹ Verhees, "Mitteilbarkeit", p. 11.

³³² Though cf. *ep.* 236.6 (III, 53.7-9; *PG* 32.884A-B), where Basil states that the distinguishing characteristics of the Father, Son, and Spirit are "fatherhood, sonship, and sanctification" respectively. On this statement, see Verhees, "Transzendenz", pp. 301-302; *idem*, "Mitteilbarkeit", pp. 16-17, 19-23; Hauschild, "Basilius von Caesarea", p. 310.

Yet, this ineffability does not hinder worship. Enough is known for the believer to confess that each of the persons of the Godhead has his own hypostasis and on the basis of this confession he is able to glorify the Father, the Son, and the Spirit as inseparable members of one Godhead.³³³ For Basil, this question about the doxology is not at all a marginal issue. For both the refusal to concede that the Spirit has his own hypostasis, the error of the Sabellians, and the refusal to confess that the Spirit is an essential member of the Godhead, the error of the Pneumatomachi, make it impossible to offer the doxology. Only in the Spirit can Jesus be glorified as Lord (1 Cor 12:3) and only in the Spirit can the Father receive true adoration (Jn 4:23-24).³³⁴ Nor was the great importance that Basil attached to this point an idiosyncrasy of his pneumatology. The Council of Constantinople, in the credal statement that it drew up in 381, also stressed that a necessary part of the orthodox faith was the belief that the Spirit is “worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son”.³³⁵

³³³ *Ep.* 210.4,5 (II, 194.28-33, 196.34-36; *PG* 32.773B-C, 776C).

³³⁴ See Dörries, “Basilius”, pp. 135-136.

³³⁵ *P.* 250.15-16.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE PNEUMATOMACHIAN CONTROVERSY: CONCLUSION

1. Gregory of Nazianzus and the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople

With the death of Valens, the protector of the Arians, in the disastrous rout near Hadrianopolis in Thrace (August 9, 378), the purple passed to the orthodox Spaniard, Theodosius. The Nicene communities of the east began to assert themselves, so that by the year 379 all of the major ecclesiastical centres, except Constantinople, were in the hands of Nicene bishops.¹ Even in Constantinople, where the Arians, under their bishop Demophilus, possessed authentic popular support,² the orthodox community had received fresh hope with the accession of Theodosius. They lacked only a leader. Basil or Meletius of Antioch, the foremost leaders of the Neo-Nicene party in the east, would have been ideal choices, but both were attached to their respective sees, and by 379 Basil was dead. But Gregory of Nazianzus, who had retired to the monastery of St. Thecla at Seleucia in Isauria after the death of his parents in 374,³ was as good as either of these men.⁴ Furthermore, he was not formally attached to any see. Consequently, a delegation from Constantinople was sent to invite Gregory to be the pastor of the Nicene community in that city. After initial refusals, Gregory accepted.

At this point it is appropriate to indicate the reasons which probably lay behind Gregory's decision to leave the tranquility of his retirement and go into the eye of the ecclesiastical storm that was raging in Constantinople. The forceful insistence of the delegation from Constantinople was certainly not the sole, nor prime, reason for Gregory's acquiescence. Any answer to this question must begin with the reasons which Gregory himself gives in his great autobiographical poem:⁵

¹ N.Q. King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1960), pp. 24-27.

² On the popularity of Arianism in Constantinople, see Arnold Ehrhardt, "The First Two Years of the Reign of Theodosius I", *JEH*, XV (1964), 12.

³ *Carm.* 2.1.11. 545-549 (p. 80; *PG* 37.1067).

⁴ In his *carm.* 2.1.11.592-594 (p. 82; *PG* 37.1070), Gregory writes: "for we seemed to be among those who are well-known for their godly life and words although we had always led a rustic life." See also Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 45-46.

⁵ *Carm.* 2.1.11.595-598 (p. 82; *PG* 37.1070).

The grace of the Spirit sent us, for many bishops and sheep were calling us to be a helper of the people and assistant of the Word.

According to this passage, Gregory was called, on the one hand, by the orthodox community of Constantinople,⁶ and on the other, by the “bishops”. Louis Tillemont understands the latter to be not only the bishops of the district surrounding Constantinople, but also Basil and Meletius of Antioch.⁷ Pierre Batiffol builds on this understanding when he writes:⁸

It is not improbable that he [Gregory] was the envoy of Meletius, the bishop of Antioch, or else that of Basil in his final days.

And X. Hürth has gone so far as to assert that Gregory arrived in Constantinople even before Basil’s death on January 1, 379.⁹ Nevertheless, both Paul Gallay¹⁰ and Christoph Jungck¹¹ have decisively shown that Gregory went to Constantinople only after the death of Basil. However, it seems certain that Basil, in his final days, advised him to go.¹² Thus after Basil’s death, Gregory probably saw himself as the heir of Basil’s labours in the defence of the truth, especially with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and this was the decisive factor which led him to leave his cell to go to Constantinople.¹³

From his small church of the Anastasia,¹⁴ Gregory, combining his rhetorical education and innate love of words with a deep desire to

⁶ See also *carm.* 2.1.11. 1128 (p. 108; *PG* 37.1106); *or.* 36.3 (*PG* 36.268C).

⁷ *Mémoires*, IX, 410-411. See also Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 45.

⁸ *Le Siège apostolique* (Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1924), pp.112-113.

⁹ “De Gregorii Nazianzeni orationibus funebribus” (Unpublished dissertation, Strasbourg, 1906), p. 60, n.1. Cited by Christoph Jungck, ed. and trans., *Gregor von Nazianz: De vita sua* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1974), p. 178.

¹⁰ *Vie*, p. 136, n.2.

¹¹ *De vita sua*, p. 178.

¹² The basis for this assertion is found in *or.* 43.2 (*PG* 36.497A), where Gregory says that his decision to go to Constantinople was not taken without the “advice of that noble champion of the truth”. See also Gallay, *Vie*, p. 135, n. 4; Stanislas Ciet, *Sasimes: Une méprise de saint Basile* (Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1941), p. 87, n. 2. On the other hand, H.-D. Altendorf [“Ritter, Adolf Martin: *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II. ökumenischen Konzils*”, *ThL*, XCII (1967), 514, n. 4] believes that this statement should not be taken too seriously.

¹³ Cf. F.W. Norris, “Gregory Nazianzen’s Doctrine of Jesus Christ” (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1970), p. 17.

¹⁴ Upon his arrival in Constantinople, Gregory found the orthodox community there both fragmented and extremely tiny. Gregory immediately began the re-organization of this small community and to this end, dedicated a private home to be used as their church. This house-church, which Gregory named “Anastasia” (from the Greek word for resurrection, ἀνάστασις) was given to Gregory by one of his blood-relatives. See *or.* 26.16 (*PG* 35.1249B-C). See also Gallay, *Vie*, pp. 137-138; Gilbert Dagron, *Naissance d’une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Bibliothèque Byzantine, Études, no. 7; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974), p. 448, n. 5.

proclaim the truth,¹⁵ energetically expounded the Nicene faith.¹⁶ One of his first opportunities to do so was also an ideal occasion to raise the question of the Spirit: Pentecost, 379.¹⁷ Although Gregory had had contact with the Pneumatomachi prior to his sojourn in Constantinople,¹⁸ it was only during his stay in the eastern capital that he became a leading figure in the debate concerning the nature and status of the Spirit.¹⁹ In this oration which he gave at Pentecost, 379, Gregory indicates his willingness to settle the differences between himself and his Pneumatomachian opponents. Gregory is aware that although the Pneumatomachi in Constantinople at that time refused to acknowledge the Spirit as "God", uncreated or eternal, they did not at any rate call him a creature. Rather, according to Gregory, they sought to place him in a category between Creator and creature.²⁰ Yet Gregory, deeply impressed by their spirituality,²¹ is prepared to forego the use of the term "God" with respect to the Spirit, if only they confess his divine power and the unity of the Trinity.²² Then together they could glorify the triune God.²³

However, by the spring and early summer of 380, Gregory's attitude towards the Pneumatomachi had altered significantly. In an oration given in honour of Athanasius of Alexandria,²⁴ Nazianzen states that

¹⁵ *Carm.* 2.1.11. 1246 (p. 114; *PG* 37.1114).

¹⁶ Justin Mossay ["Gregor von Nazianz in Konstantinopel (379-381 A.D.)", *By*, XLVII (1977), 223-238] remarks that the orations given by Gregory in the eastern capital reveal an energetic bishop who gave himself totally to the task of leading the church in that city to its "supernatural and eternal destination" (*ibid.*, p. 238).

¹⁷ For the date of the oration given on this occasion, *or.* 41, see excursus IV.

¹⁸ For instance, in *or.* 12.6 (*PG* 35.849B-C), given in 372, Nazianzen declares that the time had come to remove the lamp from beneath the bushel and proclaim to the Church the Godhead not only of the Father and the Son, but also of the Spirit. Though this passage does not refer explicitly to the Pneumatomachi, it does presuppose that the nature and status of the Spirit are in question. See D.F. Winslow, *The Dynamics of Salvation. A Study of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Patristic Monograph Series, no. 7; Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation Ltd., 1979), p. 122.

For discussion of Nazianzen's pneumatological statements prior to his sojourn in Constantinople, see Norris, "Doctrine", pp. 43-56; Enzo Bellini, "Il dogma trinitario nei primi discorsi di Gregorio Nazianzeno", *Aug*, XIII (1973), 525-534. It is quite possible that some of Gregory's remarks against the Pneumatomachi in his orations in Constantinople are not limited to the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople, but draw upon his knowledge of the views of the Pneumatomachi that he had encountered in Cappadocia [Letter received from W.-D. Hauschild (November 28, 1979)].

¹⁹ Cf. Bolgiani, "Esprit Saint", p. 65.

²⁰ *Or.* 41.7 (*PG* 36.437B-C). See also the discussions by Galla, *Vie*, pp. 147-149; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 86.

²¹ *Or.* 41.7,8 (*PG* 36.437C,440B-C). On Gregory's respect for these Pneumatomachi, whom at this point he regards as erring brothers, see excursus IV.

²² *Or.* 41.7-8 (*PG* 36.437D-440B).

²³ *Or.* 41.8 (*PG* 36.440C).

²⁴ For the date, see J.M. Szymusiak, "Pour une chronologie des discours de S. Grégoire de Nazianze", *VChr*, XX (1966), 188-189. Cf. Justin Mossay, ed. and trans., *Grégoire de*

when many were unsound with regard to the doctrine of the Son, and even more with respect to that of the Spirit,²⁵ Athanasius, inspired by the Spirit himself,²⁶ was the first to confess in writing that the three persons of the Godhead possess a common being.²⁷ Although this confession was accorded much respect by all who adhered to the Nicene creed, some were not prepared to give a public affirmation of their esteem. Gregory likens such men to stillborn infants: their piety bears the promise of life, but to no avail. As for himself, Gregory affirms that he was now determined to be counted among those who proclaimed the truth with boldness,²⁸ for:²⁹

I will no longer have consideration for (οἰκονομῶν) my weakness, as that is a matter of providing for the opinion of the less sound. For we have employed sufficient accommodation, and have not acquired that which is someone else's but have defiled that which is ours, actions truly characteristic of bad stewards.

Does this passage refer to Nazianzen's attempt, outlined in *or.* 41.6-8, to accommodate himself to the "weakness" of the Pneumatomachi? The possibility that this question should be answered in the affirmative is heightened by the fact that this passage occurs immediately after Gregory's praise for Athanasius' boldness in publicly declaring the divinity of the Spirit. If this interpretation is correct,³⁰ then the information which this passage supplies can be added to that which can be gleaned from *or.* 34, given around the same time as *or.* 21.³¹ For *or.* 34 clearly reveals the fruitlessness of Nazianzen's overtures to the Pneumatomachi. The Pneumatomachi are described now as blasphemers, since they do not regard the Spirit as God,³² and as those who are estranged from God (ἀλλοτριῶς ἔχει θεοῦ), since they separate the

Nazianze: Discours 20-23 (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 270; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1980), pp. 99-103. Gallay (*Vie*, p. 149) places it in 379, but a date in 380 is to be preferred.

²⁵ *Or.* 21.33 (p. 182.23-26; *PG* 35.1121C).

²⁶ *Or.* 21.7 (p. 124.24-26; *PG* 35.1089A); 21.33 (p. 182.31-33; *PG* 35.1121D-1124A).

²⁷ *Or.* 21.33 (p. 182.28-30; *PG* 35.1121C-D). See also Norris, "Doctrine", p. 99; J.M. Szymusiak, "Grégoire le théologien disciple d'Athanase" in Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie*, p. 360. Gregory is referring to Athanasius' *ep. Jov.*

²⁸ *Or.* 21.34 (pp. 182-184; *PG* 35.1124A-B).

²⁹ *Or.* 21.34 (p. 184.9-13; *PG* 35.1124B).

³⁰ Moreover, if this explanation is right, it offers yet another reason for dating this sermon in 380. Placed in 379, this sermon would be contemporaneous with *or.* 41; but, as noted above, there is a marked contrast between these two sermons with regard to the open proclamation of the Spirit's divinity.

³¹ For the date and circumstances of *or.* 34, see excursus V.

³² *Or.* 34.11 (*PG* 36.252B). See also Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 76-77; Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 87.

Spirit from the Godhead.³³ Yet another indication that the talks between Nazianzen and the Pneumatomachi were now in the final process of breaking down is given in Gregory's statement in *or.* 33.16 about orthodox believers:³⁴

They worship the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, [that is] one Godhead: God the Father, God the Son, and, if it does not annoy you, God the Holy Spirit, one nature in three distinct persons...distinct in number, but not in Godhead.

The climax and conclusion of Nazianzen's dialogue with the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople came in *or.* 31, the best known of Gregory's theological orations and his definitive statement on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Gregory begins this sermon, which he

³³ *Or.* 34.9 (*PG* 36.249B). Cf. *or.* 34.11 (*PG* 36.252B). In *or.* 39.12 (*PG* 36.348C), Nazianzen states that the ἄθεοι do not believe that the Spirit is God. Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", pp. 85-86, 87), believing that this oration was given January 6, 381, considers this description of the Pneumatomachi as definite proof that Nazianzen's efforts to accommodate the Pneumatomachi were officially terminated at that point. Apart from the fact that scholars have not yet reached a consensus on whether this oration was given on January 6, 380 or January 6, 381 (see the summaries of this discussion in Gallay, *Vie*, pp. 153-157; Bernardi, *Prédication*, pp. 199-205), there is really little difference between the phrase ἄλλοτριῶς ἔχει θεοῦ [*or.* 34.9 (*PG* 36.249B)] and ἄθεοι [*or.* 39.12 (*PG* 36.348C)]. *Or.* 39.12 states what has been affirmed in *or.* 34.9: the Pneumatomachi are godless characters because they refuse to confess the deity of the Spirit. Thus *or.* 39.12 need not be taken as an indication that Gregory's discussions with the Pneumatomachi continued into 381.

³⁴ *PG* 36.236A. Gallay (*Vie*, pp. 145-146) and Szymusiak ("Chronologie", p. 183) place *or.* 33 in 379, whereas Tillemont (*Mémoires*, IX, 463), the Maurist editors (*PG* 36.213-214) and Bernardi (*Prédication*, pp. 165-166) date *or.* 33 in 380. Bernardi argues that Nazianzen's remark in *or.* 33.13 (*PG* 36.229D) to the effect that he, unlike the Arian clergy of Constantinople, had never disobeyed an "imperial edict" (βασιλικὸν δόγμα), is a plain reference to Theodosius' edict of February 28, 380. This edict recognized as orthodox only those who were in communion with Peter of Alexandria and Damasus of Rome and who confessed their faith in one Godhead and in the equal majesty of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (*Cod. Thds.* 16.1.2 (p.833 1-13)). For the text of this edict, see p. 178.

Additional support for placing *or.* 33 in 380 is given by the open attack on the Pneumatomachian position in *or.* 33.16 (cited above) and *or.* 33.17 (*PG* 36.236B-C). In the latter, Gregory argues for the Spirit's deity from his deifying activity in baptism. Convinced that the primary locus of the deifying activity of the Spirit is baptism, Gregory asserts that if the Spirit is not honoured as God then baptism ceases to be efficacious (*PG* 36.236B-C). He admonishes the Pneumatomachi to remember the confession of faith which they gave at their baptism: "Into what were you baptized? Into the Father? Good; however, this is still Jewish. Into the Son? Good; this is no longer Jewish, but not yet perfect. Into the Holy Spirit? Excellent. This is perfect". Therefore, perfect baptism is into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, whose common name is God (*PG* 36.236C).

These statements, with their implicit anti-Pneumatomachian polemic, differ to some degree from the reconciliatory comments of *or.* 41.6-8, given at Pentecost, 379. The statements of *or.* 33.16-17 reflect to a greater extent the worsening situation between Nazianzen and his Pneumatomachian opponents which prevailed in 380. On Gregory's argument for the Spirit's deity from his deifying activity in baptism, see D.F. Winslow, "Orthodox Baptism—A Problem for Gregory of Nazianzus", *SP*, XIV (1976), 371-374; *idem*, *Dynamics*, pp. 130-145.

preached at some point between July and November, 380³⁵ by citing a theme common to most Pneumatomachian groups:³⁶

But, they [the Pneumatomachi] ask, what do you say about the Holy Spirit? From where do you introduce to us a strange god about whom Scripture is silent (ἄγραφον)?

But Gregory knows of a veritable “swarm” of Scriptural testimonies about the Spirit’s divinity,³⁷ and moreover is aware that the Spirit’s deity is one of those items which Christ said would be taught clearly to believers only after the Spirit had come to dwell among them (cf. Jn 14:26).³⁸ Thus, one must recognize that the Scriptures contain a gradual revelation about the Godhead.³⁹

The Old Testament proclaimed the Father clearly, but the Son more obscurely. The New Testament plainly revealed the Son, but only hinted at the deity of the Spirit. Now the Holy Spirit lives among us and gives us a clearer manifestation of himself. For it was not safe for the Son to be proclaimed openly while the deity of the Father was not yet confessed, nor for the [deity of] the Holy Spirit to be added as a burden, if I may use so bold an expression, when that of the Son had not yet been accepted.

However, the major argument of the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople turned on their belief that within the Godhead the only conceivable relationship is one of unbegotten and begotten. If the Spirit is divine, then three possibilities emerge: 1) the Spirit is unbegotten, thus there are two sources within the Godhead; 2) the Spirit is begotten of the Father, thus the Spirit and the Son are brothers; 3) the Spirit is begotten of the Son, thus the Spirit is the grandson of the Father.⁴⁰ Gregory rejects all of

³⁵ For the date, see Gallay, *Vie*, pp. 177-186, 252; *idem* and Maurice Jourjon, eds. and trans., *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques)* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 250; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978), pp. 13-14. Szymusiak (“Chronologie”, pp. 185-186, 189), on the other hand, believes that the theological orations were preached during Lent of 380, except for *or.* 31, which he feels was delayed and not given until Pentecost of that year.

³⁶ *Or.* 31.1 (p. 276.5-6; *PG* 36.133B). The importance of the “silence of Scripture” for the position of Gregory’s Pneumatomachian opponents is well illustrated by Nazianzen’s statement in *or.* 31.21 (p. 314.1; *PG* 36.156C): “Time and again you return to the silence of Scripture”. See also *or.* 31.12 (pp. 296.1-298.5; *PG* 36.145B-C); 31.29 (p. 332.1-4; *PG* 36.165A-B); Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 78, 80, 84-85.

³⁷ *Or.* 31.29 (p. 332.1-4; *PG* 36.165B-C). He lists these testimonies in *or.* 31.29-30 (pp. 332.5-338.19; *PG* 36.165B-169A). Hanson (“Tradition”, p. 254) describes this list as “a densely packed and beautifully expressed cento of biblical allusions”.

³⁸ *Or.* 31.27 (pp. 328.6-330.19; *PG* 36.164B-C).

³⁹ *Or.* 31.26 (p. 326.4-11; *PG* 36.161C). For comments on this well-known passage, see Jacques Rousse, “Grégoire de Nazianze”, *DSP*, VI (1967), 944; Hanson, “Tradition”, pp. 253-255; Gallay and Jourjon, *Discours 27-31*, pp. 326-329, n. 2; Winslow, *Dynamics*, pp. 124-126; Pelikan, “Spiritual Sense”, pp. 344-345.

⁴⁰ *Or.* 31.7 (pp. 286.1-288.9; *PG* 36.140C). See also Holl, *Amphilochius*, p. 170; Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 80-81; Gallay and Jourjon, *Discours 27-31*, p. 53.

these alternatives concerning the Spirit's mode of origin. Instead, going beyond the cautious statements of his friend Basil,⁴¹ he declares on the basis of Jn 15:26 that the characteristic property of the Spirit is his "procession" (ἐκπόρευσις) from the Father, which Gregory regards as a parallel to the Son's "generation" (γέννησις).⁴² He states:⁴³

[The Spirit] is not a creature, in that he proceeds from the Father; he is not a Son, in that he is not begotten. But he is God, in that he is between the Unbegotten and Begotten. Thus, he escapes the nets of your syllogisms and is revealed as God, since he is stronger than your divisions. What then does 'procession' (ἡ ἐκπόρευσις) mean? You explain the Father's 'ingeneracy', and I will seek to give you an account of the 'generation' of the Son and the 'procession' of the Spirit; and thus let us both go mad through peering into the mysteries of God. Who are we [to pry into such matters]? We can neither understand what lies at our feet, nor 'number the sand of the sea, the drops of rain, the days of eternity' [Sir 1:2], let alone penetrate 'the depths of God' [1 Cor 2:10], and give an account of his nature, which is so ineffable and far beyond our reason.

Like the "generation" of the Son, the "procession" of the Spirit is ultimately an incomprehensible mystery.⁴⁴ Nonetheless, despite the limitations of human reason and language, Gregory is determined to hold on to the belief that there are distinctions, though not separations, in the Godhead. Consequently, the three-fold character of the Godhead must be recognized and the Spirit confessed as God.⁴⁵

'Is the Spirit God?' Certainly. 'What then, is he one in being [with the Father and the Son]?' Yes, if he is God.⁴⁶

The ultimate basis for these assertions is Nazianzen's conviction that the universal redemption wrought by Christ is "brought home" to the individual only by the Spirit.

If the Spirit is of the same order [of creation] as myself, how can he deify me, or join me to the Godhead?⁴⁷

Nazianzen thus concludes:⁴⁸

⁴¹ See pp. 143-147.

⁴² Holl, *Amphilochius*, pp. 160-162, 169-171; Winslow, *Dynamics*, p. 121; A. de Halleux, "La Profession de l'Esprit-Saint dans le symbole de Constantinople", *RTL*, X (1979), 32-33, 34. Nazianzen seems to have been the first to provide this terminological answer to the question about the Spirit's mode of origin (Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 300, n.6).

⁴³ *Or.* 31.8 (p.290.11-23; *PG* 36.141B-C). Trans. Bettenson, *Later Christian Fathers*, pp. 113-114, revised.

⁴⁴ Norris, "Doctrine", p. 122; Winslow, *Dynamics*, pp. 121-122.

⁴⁵ Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 246-247; Norris, "Doctrine", pp. 101-105, 118-122.

⁴⁶ *Or.* 31.10 (p. 292.1-2; *PG* 36.144A).

⁴⁷ *Or.* 31.4 (p. 282.13-14; *PG* 36.137B).

⁴⁸ *Or.* 31.28 (p. 330.1-5; *PG* 36.164C-D).

Such is my position with regard to these questions. May I, as well as my friends, always maintain this position and worship God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, three distinct persons, one Godhead, undivided in glory, honour, being and dominion (δόξη καὶ τιμῇ, καὶ οὐσίᾳ, καὶ βασιλείᾳ μὴ μεριζομένην), as one of the inspired men explained not long ago (μικρῷ πρόσθεν).

Whatever the identity of the “inspired man” of whom Gregory speaks in this passage,⁴⁹ the unequivocal confession of the Spirit’s deity in this and other passages of *or.*31 clearly reveals that the discussions between Nazianzen and the Pneumatomachi had been terminated without any positive results.⁵⁰ Why did these discussions fail? Ritter suggests that the influence of the anti-Nicene Eleusius of Cyzicus upon the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople was chiefly responsible for their failure.⁵¹ Eleusius had never accepted the Nicene creed and, at the head of an intransigent minority, seems to have dissociated himself from the Homoiousian delegation to the west in 366 under the leadership of Eustathius of Sebaste, which was part of an attempt by the Homoiousians to establish a harmonious relationship between themselves and the supporters of the Nicene creed.⁵² Later, at the Synod of Cyzicus in 376, the Pneumatomachi, under the joint leadership of Eleusius and Eustathius of Sebaste, affirmed what Basil had heard was a blasphemous position on the Holy

⁴⁹ In the past it was generally accepted that “the inspired man” of whom Gregory speaks in this passage is Gregory Thaumaturgus, the Origenist bishop of Neocaesarea who instructed Basil’s grandmother Macrina in the faith. The basis for this opinion is the striking similarity between Nazianzen’s statement that the Godhead is “undivided in glory, honour, being and dominion” (δόξη, καὶ τιμῇ, καὶ οὐσίᾳ, βασιλείᾳ μὴ μεριζομένην) and a section of the creed ascribed to Thaumaturgus which affirms that “the perfect Trinity is undivided in glory, eternity and dominion” (τριὰς τελεία, δόξη, καὶ αἰδιότητι καὶ βασιλείᾳ μὴ μεριζομένη) (PG 10.985A). See C.P. Caspari, *Alte und Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel* (Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1964), pp. 27-28.

However, Abramowski (“Bekenntnis”, pp. 150-151) has recently argued that the phrase “not long ago” (μικρῷ πρόσθεν) is hardly appropriate for a man who had died approximately sixty years before Gregory had been born! In her view, this section of the creed, as well as that on the Spirit, comes from the hand of someone who is heavily dependent upon the ideas of Basil, namely Gregory of Nyssa himself (*ibid.*, pp. 145-162). Consequently, the “inspired man” mentioned by Gregory of Nazianzus may in fact be a reference to his friend Basil.

Abramowski’s arguments have been received favourably by Rist (“Basil’s ‘Neoplatonism’”, pp. 208-210), but not so favourably by Henri Crouzel, “La cristologia in Gregorio Taumaturgo”, *Gre*, LXI (1980), 745-746 and n. 6. See also B.M. Weischer, “Die Glaubenssymbole des Epiphanius von Salamis und des Gregor Thaumaturgus im Qêrellos”, *OC*, LXI (1977), 25; Fedwick, *Charisma*, p. 3, n. 10.

⁵⁰ Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 77.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 77, n. 3.

⁵² Shapland, *Letters*, pp. 25-26, n. 46; Henri de Riedmatten, “Eleusius de Cyzique”, *DHGE*, XV (1963), 144-145; Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 81-82; *idem*, “Gregor von Nyssa ‘In suam ordinationem’”. Eine Quelle für die Geschichte des Konzils von Konstantinopel 381?”, *ZKG*, LXXIX (1968), 321-322.

Spirit akin to that of Eunomius.⁵³ When Eustathius died *ca.* 377,⁵⁴ Eleusius became the leading figure in the Pneumatomachian party.⁵⁵ Probably under his direction a synod was held at Antioch in Caria in 378, where the Pneumatomachi formally indicated their support for the so-called Second creed of Antioch and their repudiation of the Nicene creed.⁵⁶ Although a number of conservative members of the synod refused to sanction these measures and subsequently identified themselves with the Neo-Nicenes,⁵⁷ the rest proceeded to renounce any ties they had had with the Neo-Nicenes and began to draw up plans for their own ecclesiastical communion.⁵⁸

Yet another reason for the failure of the discussions between Gregory and the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople could have been the promulgation of the edict *Cod. Thds.* 16.1.2 by Theodosius on February 28, 380. According to this edict:⁵⁹

We should believe in the sole deity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit in equal majesty and holy Trinity.

We order those following this law to assume the name of Catholic Christians, but the rest, since we judge them demented and insane, to sustain the infamy of heretical dogma and their conventicles not to take the name of churches, to be smitten first by divine vengeance, then also by the punishment of our authority, which we have claimed in accordance with the celestial will.

A passing allusion to this edict in Gregory's *or.* 34 shows that he was certainly aware of it.⁶⁰ Perhaps its strictures provided added incentive to cease all communication with those who now had been officially declared to be "demented and insane". In any case, when Theodosius entered Constantinople in November, 380, Gregory had abandoned any attempt to reconcile himself to his Pneumatomachian opponents. As for Eleusius, he was yet to play a significant role in the dialogue between the

⁵³ See pp. 45-46.

⁵⁴ See p. 48.

⁵⁵ Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 74.

⁵⁶ Socrates, *h.e.* 5.4 (*PG* 67.569B-C); Sozomen, *h.e.* 7.2.3-4 (p. 303. 10-17; *PG* 67.1420B); Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 75-76. Cf. Loofs, "Macedonianism", p. 229; Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1085. On the pneumatological section of the so-called Second creed of Antioch, see p. 30, n. 102.

⁵⁷ Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1085; Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 76; May, "Datierung", p. 51.

⁵⁸ Sozomen, *h.e.* 7.2.4 (p. 303.14-15; *PG* 67.1420B). See also Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1085; May, "Datierung", p. 51.

⁵⁹ *Cod. Thds.* 16.1.2 (p. 833.6-13). Trans. P.R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State & Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535* (London: S.P.C.K., 1966), I, 354, revised. See also Karl Baus *et al.*, *The Imperial Church from Constantine to the Early Middle Ages*, trans. Anselm Biggs (New York: The Seabury Press, 1980), pp. 68-69.

⁶⁰ See excursus V.

orthodox and the Pneumatomachi. For in the following year, the emperor invited him and Marcianus of Lampascus⁶¹ to the Council of Constantinople as the leaders of a delegation of thirty-six Pneumatomachian bishops from the western coastal areas of Asia Minor. Ritter finds it inexplicable that a person with a record like that of Eleusius should have been chosen to lead such a delegation.⁶² He concludes that the emperor alone was responsible for this choice, and he did so only after the death of Meletius, when he saw an opportunity to implement his plan for a union between the orthodox and the Pneumatomachi. However, Gerhard May⁶³ points out that Eleusius was a firm anti-Arian, who had been deposed by the Homoean Synod of Constantinople in 360, and later had been banished from Cyzicus by Valens. Consequently, the invitation of Eleusius is not as inconceivable as it might appear at first sight.

Upon Theodosius' triumphant entry into Constantinople (November 24, 380), the Arian bishop Demophilus was expelled and Gregory installed as bishop in the Church of the Apostles.⁶⁴ Theodosius, determined to establish the eastern church on the bedrock of Nicaea, convened a council for this purpose in Constantinople in May of 381. One of the first acts of the council was to recognize Gregory as the rightful bishop of Constantinople. Thus, the council disregarded the fraudulent claims of a certain Maximus, who had arrived in Constantinople shortly after Gregory, with the intent of being consecrated bishop of that see. Maximus had managed to deceive Gregory into befriending him,⁶⁵ and with the support of Peter of Alexandria, was secretly consecrated bishop of Constantinople. Maximus and his supporters, however, were driven out of the city and a later attempt to convince Theodosius of the legality of his claim was a failure.⁶⁶ But Gregory's episcopacy was to be very brief, cut short by the dissension that attended the council.

The first president of the council was Meletius of Antioch. But to the

⁶¹ See p. 35, n.130.

⁶² *Konzil*, pp. 81-82. See also his "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 321-322.

⁶³ "Datierung", p. 52.

⁶⁴ For arguments on behalf of the Church of the Apostles as the site of Gregory's installation, see Carl Ullmann, *Gregory of Nazianzum*, trans. G.V. Cox (London: John W. Parker, 1851), p. 223, n.2; Jungck, *De vita sua*, p. 207. However, cf. Dagron, *Naissance*, p. 450, n. 4.

⁶⁵ Gregory went so far as to give a eulogy on Maximus. See *or.* 25 (*PG* 35.1197A-1225B).

⁶⁶ After this failure, Maximus journeyed to Italy, where he made a similar attempt with Ambrose, who was deceived, and with Damasus, who was not (King, *Theodosius*, p. 27). Gregory later denounced Maximus as "a jealous demon" [δαίμον βόσκανε: *car.* 2.1.11. 738 (p. 90; *PG* 37.1080)].

Bernardi (*Prédication*, p. 177) suggests that Maximus was able to secure Peter's support by maligning Gregory's position with regard to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. In Bernardi's

consternation and dismay of the emperor and those who had gathered for the council, Meletius died shortly after its start.⁶⁷ Before his death, this old friend of Basil,⁶⁸ whom Nazianzen was later to eulogize as that “field of the Spirit” (πνεύματος γεώργιον)⁶⁹ who had suffered much for the sake of the divine Spirit,⁷⁰ gave his approval to the emperor’s desire to effect a union between the orthodox and the Pneumatomachi.⁷¹ From the very beginning, Nazianzen would have been opposed to these discussions.⁷² His own efforts to accommodate the Pneumatomachi had resulted in complete failure, and he was now of the opinion that the time had come to put away all theological discretion and publish an unequivocal statement about the deity of the Holy Spirit. However, the gulf which lay between the orthodox and the Pneumatomachi was so wide, that it could not have been bridged without one side sacrificing all that they held dear. Thus, the Pneumatomachi, after rejecting the proposed union, left the council and instructed their adherents to refuse to agree to the faith promulgated by the Council of Nicaea.⁷³

If Gregory thought that the departure of the Pneumatomachi meant eyes, this would explain the emphasis on the Holy Spirit in *or.* 34.8-15 (*PG* 36.248D-256B). This oration was given in the late spring or early summer of 380 (see excursus V) upon the occasion of the arrival of a group of Alexandrian sailors. These sailors had brought not only a convoy of wheat to Constantinople [*or.* 34.1, 7 (*PG* 36.242A-B, 248A-B)], but also, it seems, letters of reconciliation from Peter to Gregory. Peter had realized his error of judgment in giving his support to Maximus, and now desired reconciliation. In the first half of the oration [*or.* 34.1-7 (*PG* 36.241A-248C)], Gregory makes an obvious effort to show that his trinitarian theology conforms to that of Peter.

Gallay (*Vie*, p. 173) reasons that Gregory would not have made such an attempt if the oration had not been given soon after Theodosius’ edict of February 28, 380. This edict recognized as orthodox only those who were in communion with Peter and Damasus of Rome. Had there been any question about the orthodoxy of Gregory’s doctrine of the Spirit, it would have been most natural for Gregory to raise the issue in the first half of the oration. As it is, the question of the Spirit is left to the second half of the oration, which is an exposition of trinitarian theology. Thus, the emphasis on the Spirit in the second half of *or.* 34 is better explained if it is seen as Gregory’s use of an excellent opportunity to drive home once more his argument for the Spirit’s divinity against the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople. Only a short time later Gregory would give *or.* 31 (pp. 276-342; *PG* 36.133B-172A), his major defence of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is not surprising to find a foreshadowing of that defence earlier in the year.

⁶⁷ Theodoret, *h.e.* 5.8.2 (p. 287.11-14; *PG* 82.1209A-B). See also Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 53.

⁶⁸ See pp. 33-36.

⁶⁹ *Carm.* 2.1.11. 1517 (p. 128; *PG* 37.1134). For the expression, cf. 1 Cor 3:9.

⁷⁰ *Carm.* 2.1.11.1522 (p. 128; *PG* 37.1135). See also Staats, “Basilianische Verherrlichung”, p. 242.

⁷¹ Cf. May, “Datierung”, pp. 48-49.

⁷² Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 80, n.1. Pace Baus, *Imperial Church*, p. 71.

⁷³ Socrates, *h.e.* 5.8 (*PG* 67.577A-B). See also Sozomen, *h.e.* 7.7.5 (p. 309.6-9; *PG* 67.1432A-B); Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 85. For the place of these discussions with the Pneumatomachi in the course of the council, see Socrates, *h.e.* 5.8 (*PG* 67.576B-577B); Sozomen, *h.e.* 7.7.1 (pp. 308.14-309.9; *PG* 67.1429B-1432A); Adolf Lippold, “Theodosius I”, *PWK*, Suppl. XIII (1973), 854; Simonetti, *Crisi ariana*, p. 531, n. 12; Baus, *Imperial Church*, p. 71 and n. 63. However, cf. Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. n. 1; 82; 256-257; May, “Datierung”, p. 48.

the victory of his pneumatological viewpoint, he was sadly mistaken, as he was to learn after he had been elected the new president of the council. When the majority of the council gave their assent to a credal statement (C) which failed to give an explicit confession of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and his oneness in being with the Father and the Son, Gregory was adamant in his refusal to countenance such a document. Essential for an evaluation of Nazianzen's reaction to this pneumatological statement is *carm.* 2.1.11.1703-1765, a section of Nazianzen's great autobiographical poem, which he wrote in 382.⁷⁴ The wealth of information which this obscure passage contains remained untapped until Ritter devoted a substantial excursus to its interpretation in his book on the Council of Constantinople.⁷⁵

Gregory bemoans the fact that the pneumatological article of the creed drawn up by the majority of the council has polluted "the beautiful source of our old faith", namely the teaching proclaimed at Nicaea. Gregory regards the men who are responsible for this "pollution" as dogmatically indecisive, men who "make Christ a source of gain", since they allow their theology to be totally determined by the circumstances and by what is pleasing to the emperor.⁷⁶ The pneumatological statement which came out of their deliberations is fine as far as it goes; the point is that it does not go far enough! As a result, it is ambiguous hodge-podge which allows the Pneumatomachi to have access to the Church of God. Gregory was glad that he was often so sick that he could not attend the sessions of the council. Thus, even though he was president at the time all of these proceedings were taking place, he cannot be held responsible for what the council finally issued with regard to the Spirit. Just as Abraham of old had to separate himself from Lot, who, Gregory intimates, fell in with the wicked Sodomites, so Gregory had to part company with those who wish to accommodate the ungodly Pneumatomachi.⁷⁷

Gregory was not alone in his opposition to the majority of the council

⁷⁴ Jungck, *De vita sua*, p. 13 and n. 1.

⁷⁵ *Konzil*, pp. 253-270. Ritter's interpretation of this section of Nazianzen's autobiographical poem is to be preferred to that of Jungck (*De vita sua*, pp. 220-225) and Staats ("Basilianische Verherrlichung", pp. 249-251). However, W.-D. Hauschild ["Buchbesprechungen: *Gregor von Nazianz: De vita sua*. Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und erklärt von Christoph Jungck", *AHC*, IX (1977), 213-216] rightly points out that there is no evidence in this section of Nazianzen's autobiographical poem to support Ritter's thesis that C formed the basis of the discussion between the orthodox and the Pneumatomachi regarding a possible union.

⁷⁶ *Carm.* 2.1.11.1703-1732 (pp.136-138; *PG* 37.1148-1150).

⁷⁷ *Carm.* 2.1.11.1733-1765 (pp.138-140; *PG* 37.1150-1153).

members. Of the few who stood by him, the most significant figure was his cousin, Amphilochius of Iconium.⁷⁸ This is surprising since Amphilochius was a disciple of Basil, whose reservation with regard to the question of the open confession of the Spirit's divinity has already been noted.⁷⁹ Yet, after his mentor's death, Amphilochius took the step Basil had never taken. For Jerome, who had come to Constantinople in 379 or 380 and had stayed for the council, reports:⁸⁰

Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, recently read to me a book *On the Holy Spirit*, arguing that he is God, and that he is to be worshipped, and that he is omnipotent.

This report, along with the tone of the statement issued by the Synod of Iconium, over which Amphilochius had presided,⁸¹ and his signature to Nazianzen's will, which was drawn up on May 31, 381,⁸² indicates that Amphilochius took Nazianzen's side in the debate over the question of the confession of the Spirit's deity.⁸³

However, the legitimacy of Gregory's position as bishop of Constantinople was called into question by Ascholius of Thessalonica and Timothy of Alexandria,⁸⁴ both of whom came late to the council. Their questioning was the straw that broke the camel's back. Nazianzen was accused of technically violating the Nicene canon which prohibited the

⁷⁸ On the others who supported Gregory, see Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 84, n. 3; 108, n. 3.

⁷⁹ See, e.g., pp. 43-47.

⁸⁰ *Vir.* 133 (PG 23.755A). Trans. Quasten, *Patrology*, III, 299. See also the comments on this report by Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 173, n. 2; Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 296, n.3. On this period in Jerome's life, see Kelly, *Jerome*, pp. 66-71.

⁸¹ See pp. 46-47.

⁸² *Test.* (PG 37.393C-D). For an English translation of this document, see William Cave, *Lives of the Most Eminent Fathers of the Church*, rev. Henry Cary (Oxford: 1840), III, 79-82.

⁸³ See Holl, *Amphilochius*, p. 27; Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 84, n. 3; 191; May, "Datierung", p. 49 and n. 50. Pace Gribomont ("Intransigence", p. 121) who believes that "the creedal formula of Constantinople is strongly stamped with the Basilian economy, thanks, among others, to the mediation of Amphilochius..."

Another text which may be cited as an indication of Amphilochius' pneumatological position during this time is *RF*. This text, which has been transmitted only in Syriac, has a very developed section on the Spirit which reflects the pneumatological debate at the council in 381. R. Abramowski ["Das Symbol des Amphilochius", *ZNTW*, XXIX (1930), 134-135] believes that Amphilochius brought this text with him to the council as a preparatory work for the council. This conjecture, though not improbable, must remain hypothetical until further examination of the text has been undertaken [Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 117, n. 2; 305, n. 1; L. van Rompey, ed. and trans. *Amphilochii Iconiensis de recta Fide* in Cornelis Datema, ed., *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera* (Corpus Christianorum, series graeca, vol. 3; Turnhout: Brepols/Leuven: University Press, 1978), pp. 312-313].

⁸⁴ On Ascholius, see Karl Baus, "Acholios", *LTK*, I (1957), 110; N.Q. King, "The 150 Holy Fathers of the Council of Constantinople 381 A.D.", *SP*, I (1957), 636. On Timothy, see H.G. Opitz, "Timotheos I., Bischof von Alexandrien", *PWK*, VI/A (1937), 1354; King, "150 Holy Fathers", p. 636.

transference of sees, since he had transferred his see from Sasima, which he had never actually accepted, to Constantinople.⁸⁵ Nazianzen, worn out by the dissension which had attended the council, promptly tendered his resignation to Theodosius not only as the president of the council but also as the bishop of Constantinople.⁸⁶ That his failure to convince his episcopal colleagues to adopt his position on the question of the Spirit played a large part in his decision to quit the eastern capital is easily seen from the content and tone of his farewell sermon, which he preached before his colleagues at some point during the month of June.⁸⁷ Gregory is aware that God takes pleasure, not in numbers, but in the few who hold fast to pure doctrine.⁸⁸ And what is this pure doctrine? In its negative form, it is a refusal to consider any member of the Godhead as a created being.⁸⁹ In its positive form, it is an open confession that the Father, Son and Spirit share the same nature and being,⁹⁰ and that therefore they deserve to receive the same honour and worship.⁹¹ Moreover, since correct doctrine cannot be separated from correct practice, those who hold to the former will deny “the Moabites and Ammonites”, that is those who were too inquisitive about the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit, access to the Church of God.⁹² On this and other questions, Gregory knows only too well that the majority of the council do not totally agree with him,⁹³ yet he does concede that he and his listeners are allies in a common cause,⁹⁴ for they both honour the Trinity, which is their common hope.⁹⁵ The prominent place which Gregory assigns to the proper confession of correct trinitarian doctrine in this public vindication of his two-year ministry in Constantinople is a good indication that a major reason for his resignation as president of the council and bishop of the city was his irresolvable difference with the majority of his colleagues over this issue.⁹⁶ The tone of his remarks about the faith of these colleagues is considerably milder than that in *carm.* 2.1.11. Since they were present at the delivery of this public defence,

⁸⁵ See Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 103-105. On Nazianzen's involvement with the see of Sasima, see Giet, *Sasimes*; Gallay, *Vie*, pp. 100-117.

⁸⁶ See Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 105-107.

⁸⁷ Bernardi, *Predication*, pp. 226-228.

⁸⁸ *Or.* 42.7-8 (*PG* 36.465C-468B).

⁸⁹ *Or.* 42.3 (*PG* 36.460C); 42.6 (*PG* 36.465B-C); 42.17 (*PG* 36.477C-480A).

⁹⁰ *Or.* 42.15 (*PG* 36.476B); 42.16 (*PG* 36.476C).

⁹¹ *Or.* 42.16 (*PG* 36.476C).

⁹² *Or.* 42.18 (*PG* 36.480A). Cf. *carm.* 2.1.11. 1737-1738 (p. 138; *PG* 37.1151).

⁹³ *Or.* 42.22 (*PG* 36.484C-485A).

⁹⁴ *Or.* 42.18 (*PG* 36.480B-C).

⁹⁵ *Or.* 42.25 (*PG* 36.488C).

⁹⁶ See also Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 107, n.22; 109; 268.

Gregory had to choose his words carefully, whereas in the composition of his autobiographical poem, he was at liberty to give full vent to his anger.

With this defence, Gregory bade farewell to the council and to the city of Constantinople. However, Gregory was not content to defend his own position with regard to the question of the Spirit but, in the following year, even sought to justify Basil's prudent handling of the matter.⁹⁷ The tone of this justification leads one to believe that some members of the Council of Constantinople had appealed to Basil's attitude as a precedent for their own conduct.⁹⁸ For Gregory's vindication of his dead friend opens with the statement that his remarks about Basil's position are directed against those who support their own "evil deeds" with the misappropriation of the conduct of others.⁹⁹ And later on, he states that he is defending Basil:¹⁰⁰

In order that none, thinking that only the terms found in his writings are the standard (ῥῆρον) of orthodoxy, have a weaker faith and believe that the proof of their wickedness is his theology, which is the product of both his circumstances and the Spirit.

According to Gregory, Basil avoided an unqualified confession of the Spirit's divinity, since the Homoeans, with the support of Valens, would have used it as an excuse to banish Basil and thus the orthodox party would have lost the voice of one of its strongest champions. In such a critical period, Basil therefore employed equivalent expressions which taught the same truth.¹⁰¹ Of course, Gregory assures his audience, Basil privately confessed to him that the Spirit is God and that he is to be worshipped as one in being with the Father and the Son.¹⁰² This tendentious justification may be viewed as yet another veiled attack on those who drew up the pneumatological statement in the creed composed at Constantinople in 381. They cannot claim to be the heirs of Basil, for, Gregory implies, if Basil were alive at the time of the council, he would have proclaimed the Spirit as God without any hesitation!¹⁰³ Nazianzen's last years were spent on his family estate in Arianus, where he devoted

⁹⁷ Or. 43.68-69 (PG 36.585C-589C). This sermon was given on the anniversary of Basil's death, January 1, 382. See Gallay, *Vie*, p. 215; Bernardi, *Prédication*, p. 236.

⁹⁸ Cf. Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 264, n.2.

⁹⁹ Or. 43.68 (PG 36.585C-D).

¹⁰⁰ Or. 43.69 (PG 36.589B).

¹⁰¹ Or. 43.68 (PG 36.585C-588C). See also De Ghellinck, "Cas de conscience", pp. 321-322; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 26.

¹⁰² Or. 43.69 (PG 36.589A). See also De Ghellinck, "Cas de conscience", p. 322; Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 26; Gribomont, "Intransigence", p. 114.

¹⁰³ See or. 43.68 (PG 36.588A).

himself to contemplation, to the composition of verse and to extensive correspondence with his friends. He refused to attend any more councils,¹⁰⁴ preferring now to employ his pen as a vehicle for proclaiming the truth about the Spirit.

Let us stand in awe before the great Spirit, who is like unto God, and by whom I know God. He is clearly God and he deifies me here below. [He is] omnipotent, the author of divine gifts, the theme of the hymn of the holy choir [of angels], the giver of life to both heavenly and terrestrial beings. [He is] seated on high, and proceeds from the Father. [He is] the divine force [who always] acts with freedom. [He is] neither the Son, for the excellent [Father] has only one Son who is full of goodness, nor is he separate from the invisible deity, but [he is] equal in glory [with the Father and the Son].¹⁰⁵

2. Gregory of Nyssa and the Pneumatomachi of Asia Minor

Shortly before Gratian, augustus of the west, raised Theodosius to be his partner in the east, he issued a decree from Sirmium which permitted all of those bishops exiled under Valens to return home.¹⁰⁶ Hence Meletius, with whom Basil was staunchly allied, returned from exile to Antioch. At this point in time, the orthodox community of Antioch was still divided over the question of whether Meletius or his old rival, Paulinus, who had the support of the west, was the legitimate bishop of the city.¹⁰⁷ In an attempt to resolve this issue a council was called at the instigation of Meletius. The council met in September or October of 379, approximately nine months after the death of Basil and a few months after the arrival of Gregory of Nazianzus in Constantinople.¹⁰⁸ Among the 152 bishops who attended the council were a number of Basil's friends,

¹⁰⁴ For example, when Gregory was invited to attend the synod of Constantinople in 382, he wrote to Procopius, the prefect of Constantinople [*ep.* 130.1-2 (p.95.20-22; *PG* 37.255A)]: "If the truth must be known, I am inclined to avoid every assembly of bishops. For I have never seen a good end to any synod nor any solution for evils [come from them]; in fact, [they result] in an increase [of evils]. For they are always [characterized by] contentions and efforts to gain power".

¹⁰⁵ *Carm.* 1.1.3.3-9 (*PG* 37.408-409). Although this beautiful poem dates from 381 or 382 [D.A. Sykes, "The *Poemata Arcana* of St. Gregory Nazianzen", *JTS*, n.s. XXI (1970), 36-38], it foreshadowed the literary form which most of Gregory's later theological thought was to take. Sykes ["The *Poemata Arcana* of St. Gregory Nazianzen. Some Literary Problems", *BZ*, LXXII (1979), 6] notes that this poem extends the arguments for divinity to the Holy Spirit "in the attempt to integrate the persons of the Trinity and yet to distinguish them".

¹⁰⁶ Socrates, *h.e.* 5.2 (*PG* 67.568A); Sozomen, *h.e.* 7.1.3 (p.302.1013; *PG* 67.1417B). See also Lietzmann, *Church Fathers*, p. 36; King, *Theodosius*, pp. 22-23.

¹⁰⁷ See p. 33-34

¹⁰⁸ For the date, see Gregory of Nyssa, *v. Macr.* 15 (p. 386.22-24; *PG* 46.973D). On the council, see Gustave Bardy, "Le Concile d'Antioche (379)", *RB*, XLV (1933), 196-213.

including Eusebius of Samosata¹⁰⁹ and Diodore of Tarsus,¹¹⁰ as well as Basil's own brother, Gregory of Nyssa. The acceptance of the Spirit's deity and his oneness in being with the Father and the Son by this council, a move designed to demonstrate to the west the orthodoxy of Meletius and his followers, constitutes a landmark in the struggle of the Neo-Nicene party against the Pneumatomachi. Yet, outside of the fact that Gregory attended this council, nothing definite is known of his particular role in these decisions.¹¹¹

Of the ecclesiastical tasks which occupied much of Gregory's attention after his return from Antioch,¹¹² one is especially important for the subject of this study. In 380 Gregory went to Iborra in Pontus in order to supervise the election of a new bishop for that city. While he was there, a delegation from Sebaste arrived with a request for his help in the election of a new bishop in place of Eustathius, who had died. At a time when many episcopal sees of the east were falling into the hands of bishops allied to Meletius and Eusebius of Samosata, Nyssen seized the opportunity to secure this Pneumatochian stronghold for the Neo-Nicenes. Gregory journeyed to Sebaste, where, to his complete surprise, he himself was elected bishop.¹¹³ Although he stayed in the see for only

¹⁰⁹ Originally an Homoean, Eusebius accepted the Nicene creed along with Meletius of Antioch during the reign of Jovian (363-364). Henceforth he was an influential member of the Neo-Nicene party. After spending four years in exile (374-378), he was allowed to return home by the decree issued by Gratian at Sirmium. Two years later, he was killed by an Arian woman, who cast a brick at his head. For further information, see Michel Spanneut, "Eusèbe de Samosate", *DHGE*, XV (1963), 1473-1475; F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (2nd ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 482.

¹¹⁰ According to Basil [*ep.* 244.3 (III, 77.21-22; *PG* 32.916C)], Diodore was a "pupil" (θρέμμα) of Silvanus of Tarsus. But in the dispute between the orthodox and the Pneumatomachi led by Eustathius, he was from the very beginning an opponent of Eustathius [see *ep.* 99.3 (I, 217.27-30; *PG* 32.501B)]. This would explain the later attack of Eustathius on Basil because of his friendship with Diodore [*ep.* 244.3 (III, 76.1-3, 21-25; *PG* 32.916A, C)].

Although Diodore played an important role at the Council of Constantinople, it is still uncertain what influence, if any, he had on the pneumatological statement of this council. See De Halleux, "Profession", p. 17, n. 70. For further information on Diodore, see Luise Abramowski, "Diodore de Tarse", *DHGE*, XV (1960), 496-504; Grillmeier, *Christ*, I, 352-360.

¹¹¹ May, "Gregor von Nyssa", p. 113. However, Hübner ("Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 206-209) has suggested that Nyssen wrote the tractate *comm. not.* (pp. 17-33; *PG* 45.176A-185D) expressly for this council in the hope that it might effect an understanding between the followers of Meletius and the supporters of Paulinus, whose trinitarian theology was akin to that of Marcellus of Ancyra.

¹¹² For a discussion of these tasks, see May, "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 113-116.

¹¹³ For a discussion of this event, see Franz Diekamp, "Die Wahl Gregors von Nyssa zum Metropolit von Sebaste im Jahre 380", *TQ*, LC (1908), 384-401. Diekamp (*ibid.*, pp. 392-393) believed that Nyssen stayed at Sebaste from April to June, 380. Jean Daniélou ["La Chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse", *SP*, VII (1966), 162] basically accepts this dating, but places Nyssen's sojourn in the months of March, April and May. Pierre Maraval

two or three months, it was long enough to become embroiled in a fierce discussion with the Pneumatomachian followers of Eustathius who were still resident in the city. Slandered as a tritheist and Sabellian, and as one who was introducing doctrinal innovations which had no basis in Scripture or tradition, Gregory replied with an open letter to a doctor named Eustathius.¹¹⁴

According to Gregory, the real reason behind these slanderous attacks is the fact that he believes the Spirit is an essential member of the Godhead. By contrast, his opponents refused to concede that the term "God" is an appropriate one for the Spirit, though they did admit that the Spirit shares in all of the other divine attributes.¹¹⁵ The reason for this refusal was that they believed the application of this term to the Spirit implied that he shares the same nature as the Father and the Son, which to their mind, was false.¹¹⁶ Gregory, drawing upon the ideas of his brother without explicitly naming him,¹¹⁷ replied that any assertion about the nature of the Godhead must be based upon the knowledge of its activity, since contemplation of that nature as it is in itself is impossible for created beings.¹¹⁸ On the basis of the axiom that identity of activity indicates community of nature, Nyssen argues:¹¹⁹

[Grégoire de Nysse: *Vie de Sainte Macrine* (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 178; Paris: Les Éditions de Cerf, 1971), pp. 62-64] has challenged this dating and argued for a sojourn in the autumn of 380, during the months of October and November.

¹¹⁴ *Trin.* (pp. 3-16; PG 32.684C-696C). In the Migne edition, the greater part of this letter is included among Basil's correspondence as *ep.* 189. For an analysis of this letter, see Werner Jaeger, *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom Der Heilige Geist*, ed. by Hermann Dörries (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966), pp. 5-26. For the date of the letter, see *ibid.*, pp. 6-9; Gerhard May, "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa" in Marguerite Harl, ed., *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971), pp. 57-58. For other references to the charges brought against Nyssen by the Pneumatomachi of Sebaste, see his *epp.* 19.10-20 (pp. 65.10-68.14; PG 46.1076B-1080A); 5 (pp. 31.2-34.7; PG 46.1029B-1032D).

¹¹⁵ *Trin.* (pp. 8.15-20, 10.8-14; PG 32.689C, 692B-C). See also Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 16-19. For an examination of the Pneumatomachian position presented in *Trin.*, see Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", pp. 74-76.

¹¹⁶ *Trin.* 6 (p. 10.14-17; PG 32.692C). See also Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 19.

¹¹⁷ It is surprising that Nyssen never expressly mentions his brother in his writings against the Pneumatomachi. May ("Verhältnis", p. 514) suggests that Nyssen, like Nazianzen, found Basil's pneumatological thought to be inadequate in certain areas. But, unlike Nazianzen who attempted to justify Basil's reserve, Nyssen took the different route of silently correcting the "inadequacies" which he found in Basil. However, although Nyssen goes beyond his brother's trinitarian and pneumatological statements, he is closely dependent upon his brother's work. See May, "Verhältnis", pp. 512-515.

¹¹⁸ *Trin.* 6 (pp. 10.17-11.3; PG 32.692C-D). See also Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 19.

¹¹⁹ *Trin.* 6 (p. 11.4-7, 12-15; PG 32.692D-693A, 693A). For a complete discussion of this theme, see G. Isaye, "L'Unité de l'opération divine dans les écrits trinitaires de saint Grégoire de Nysse", *RSR*, XXVII (1937), 422-439; Martien Parmentier, "St. Gregory of Nyssa's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit", *EP*, LVIII (1976), 401-414 [hereafter cited as "Doctrine" (1976)]. See also J.J. Verhees, "Die 'ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑΙ des Pneumas als Beweis für

If we see that the activities produced by the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit differ from one another, then from the difference of the activities we can assume that the natures which produce [these activities] are also different. ...But if we perceive that the activity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit is one, differing or varying in nothing, then from the identity of their operation it is necessary to infer the unity of their nature.

To the Pneumatomachian retort that sanctification is actually peculiar to the Spirit, Gregory replies:¹²⁰

Let no one especially assign the power of sanctification to the Spirit after he has heard the Saviour in the gospel say to the Father concerning the disciples: 'Father, sanctify them in your name' [Jn 17:11,17].

Utilizing his brother's image theology, Gregory provides yet another example of this identity of activity:¹²¹

It is not possible to behold the hypostasis of the Father except by gazing intently on it through the image. Now the image of the Father's hypostasis is the Only-Begotten, whom, in turn, no one can approach except one whose mind has been illuminated by the Holy Spirit. What does this show? That the Holy Spirit is not divorced from any activity that is produced by the Father. Thus, the identity of the activity in the case of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit plainly shows the indistinguishability of their nature.

Moreover, Gregory believes that the term "God" is a predicate which refers to a type of activity, since Scripture can use it also of devils, idols, and men.¹²² Nonetheless, whether it refers to an activity, as Gregory maintains, or to the divine nature, as his opponents assert, the identity of the activity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit must mean that they constitute one, indivisible Godhead.¹²³

A more extensive treatment of this question about the Spirit's divinity is offered in the treatise *Maced.*, which was written either shortly before the Council of Constantinople as a preparatory work for the council,¹²⁴

seine Transzendenz in der Argumentation des Gregor von Nyssa", *OCP*, XLV (1979), 19-20. Heising ("Der Heilige Geist", pp. 301-302) sees in Nyssen's emphasis on the unity of the activity of the divine persons a "sharp reaction" to the "tritheistic" overtones of Basil's trinitarian theology.

¹²⁰ *Trin.* 7 (p.11.17-20; *PG* 32.693A-B). See also Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 75; Martien Parmentier, "Saint Gregory of Nyssa's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit", *EP*, LIX (1977), 366-367 [hereafter cited as "Doctrine" (1977)].

¹²¹ *Trin.* (p.13.13-21). Most of this passage is not contained in the Migne edition.

¹²² *Trin.* 8, 5 (pp.13.24-14.18, 9.5-10.13; *PG* 32.696A-B, 689D-692C). See also the lengthy discussion of this theme in *tres dii* (pp. 35-57; *PG* 45.115A-136A). For a possible reason for Gregory's belief about the term "God", see p. 201.

¹²³ *Trin.* 8 (pp. 14.18-15.7; *PG* 32.696B-C).

¹²⁴ The opinion of Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 9. See also his earlier statement that *Maced.* was written in 381 "for the use of the Council of Constantinople" [Friedrich Mueller, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica. Pars I*, vol. III/I of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958), p. vi]. At first, Daniélou disagreed with Jaeger

or soon after the council on the basis of the discussions held at that time.¹²⁵ Gregory indicates that the major reason for the composition of the treatise was the pressing need to prevent the “rotting sore” of the Pneumatomachian heresy from corrupting the truth.¹²⁶ According to Gregory, those who were seeking to corrupt the truth about the Spirit maintained that the Spirit has no natural fellowship with either the Father or the Son. He does not naturally possess any of the attributes of divinity and cannot be said to share in the creative activity of the Father and the Son. Therefore, he ought not to be accorded the same glory and honour as the Father and the Son.¹²⁷ However, this refusal to regard the Spirit as a member of the Godhead did not entail evidently a desire to consider him a creature. Although Gregory’s opponents believed that the Spirit does not naturally possess any of the divine attributes, they did hold that he possesses all of them “perfectly”. Thus, in the realm of being, he occupies a middle position between the Godhead and the creatures.¹²⁸ Here, there is an attempt to impart a certain degree of ontological precision to Eustathius’ vague statement that the Spirit is neither God nor a creature.¹²⁹

Nonetheless, the contradictory nature of his opponents’ position is at once apparent to Gregory. According to Gregory, the ascription of deity to any object implies that it possesses in absolute perfection every attribute ascribed to it. If it is found to possess any of these attributes imperfectly, then it no longer deserves the name of deity.¹³⁰ Now, if the Pneumatomachi admit that the Spirit possesses all of the divine at-

[“*Gregorii Nysseni Opera dogmatica minora. I*, edidit Fridericus Muller”, *Gn*, XXXI (1959), 614], but later concurred with Jaeger’s opinion that *Maced.* was written before the Council. Daniélou, however, came to believe that it was written between March and May, 380, during Nyssen’s stay in Sebaste. See “Chronologie des oeuvres”, p. 163. Hauschild (“Pneumatomachen”, p. 68 and n. 2; cf. *Gottes Geist*, pp. 287-288) also follows Jaeger’s dating of *Maced.* On the other hand, Ritter (*Konzil*, p. 117, n. 2) regards Jaeger’s suggestion that *Maced.* was written for the express use of the council as hardly more than conjecture.

¹²⁵ The opinion of May, “Gregor von Nyssa”, pp. 126-128; *idem*, “Chronologie”, p. 59; Staats, “Basilianische Verherrlichung”, p. 242, n. 44; Verhees, “‘ΕΝΕΠΤΕΙΑΙ”, p. 20. Joseph Barbel [*Gregor von Nyssa: Die grosse katechetische Rede* (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, vol. 1; Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1971), p. 222] places this treatise in 381, without specifying whether it was written before or after the council.

¹²⁶ *Maced.* 1 (p.89.1-15; *PG* 45.1301C-1304A). See also Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 28; Yamamura, “Development”, pp. 18-21. For a discussion of the Pneumatomachian position which Nyssen combats in *Maced.*, see Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 68-74.

¹²⁷ *Maced.* 2 (p.90.5-14; *PG* 45.1304B). See also Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 29; Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 69, 72.

¹²⁸ *Maced.* 6-7, 9, 17 (pp.93.14-94.22, 95.27-30, 103.33-104.24; *PG* 45.1308B-1309C, 1312B, 1321C-1324B). See also Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, pp. 70-74.

¹²⁹ Hauschild, “Pneumatomachen”, p. 71.

¹³⁰ *Maced.* 3-4 (pp.90.27-92.9; *PG* 45.1304D-1305C).

tributes perfectly, then he must be divine. And if the Spirit is recognized as divine, then there remains no basis for refusing to ascribe to him the glory that is given to the Father and the Son.¹³¹ Gregory pleads for consistency: either admit that the Spirit is a creature or else recognize that he is to be glorified together with the Father and the Son.¹³²

At this point, Gregory inserts a Pneumatomachian objection, which may have been raised in the course of an actual dialogue between Gregory and his opponents.

We have been taught by Scripture that the Father is the Creator. And similarly we learn that all things came into existence through the Son [cf. Jn 1:3]. But Scripture teaches us nothing like this about the Spirit. [Hence], how reasonable is it to attribute to the Holy Spirit the same honour [as that which is given] to one who has displayed such greatness of power through his creation [of the universe]?¹³³

Because Scripture is absolutely silent about the creative activity of the Spirit, Gregory's Pneumatomachian opponents concluded that the Spirit has no share in the creative activity of the Father and the Son. Therefore, it is improper to ascribe to him the same honour as is given to the Father, who, through the display of his power at creation, shows himself worthy of human veneration. In order to answer this objection, Gregory initially has recourse to the thought of his brother.

The Father is never to be thought of without the Son nor is the Son to be apprehended apart from the Holy Spirit. For, just as it is impossible to ascend to the Father except by being raised through the Son, so it is impossible to say 'Jesus is Lord except in the Holy Spirit' [1 Cor 12:3]. Therefore, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are always revealed in the perfect Trinity in due sequence and in unity with each other. Before all of creation, before all of the ages, before any thought that can be apprehended [by the mind], it was always the case that the Father was the Father, and in the Father the Son, and with the Son the Holy Spirit.¹³⁴

Just as true knowledge of the Father and confession of Jesus' lordship are impossible without the presence of the Spirit, so the creation of the universe by the Father through the Son cannot occur without the assistance of the Spirit.

The Father is the source of power, the Son the power of the Father, and the Holy Spirit the Spirit of power. The entire creation, sensible as well as

¹³¹ *Maced.* 5-6, 7-11 (pp.92.10-93.28, 94.3-97.30; *PG* 45.1305C-1309A, 1309A-1313C).

¹³² *Maced.* 6 (pp.93.28-94.2; *PG* 45.1309A). Cf. *Maced.* 17 (pp. 103.33-104.26; *PG* 45.1321C-1324B). On this whole question, see Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1976), pp. 414-423.

¹³³ *Maced.* 11 (pp.97.30-98.4; *PG* 45.1313C-D). See also the discussion of this objection by Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1977), pp. 332-334.

¹³⁴ *Maced.* 12 (pp.98.24-99.1; *PG* 45.1316B).

incorporeal, is the achievement of this divine power. ...all of that nature which came into existence through creation [can be regarded as] a movement of will, an impulse of purpose, a transmission of power, which begins from the Father, advances through the Son, and is actualized in the Holy Spirit.¹³⁵

Nyssen finds further reasons for the conglorification of the Spirit with the Father and the Son in the fact that the Spirit is designated as “kingship” (βασιλεία) and in the fact that it is he who enables the life-giving grace, which originates with the Father and comes through the Son, to be actualized in baptism.

Basil had stated that the Spirit shares in “kingship” since he is above creation.¹³⁶ Nyssen takes this assertion one step further and states that one of the actual designations of the Spirit is “kingship”. Nyssen’s source for this deduction is a variant of the Lucan text of the Lord’s Prayer, in which instead of the clause “Your kingdom come” there occurs the reading “May your Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us”.¹³⁷ Now, Nyssen held that one of the most exalted titles for Christ was that of “king”, which ascribed to him a position of absolute sovereignty.¹³⁸ At the conclusion of *Trin.*, Nyssen had argued that Christ was constituted king in a manner analogous to the kings of ancient Israel: he was anointed. And the anointing by which Christ’s kingship is affirmed is, according to Nyssen, the Holy Spirit himself. But if the Spirit is described as the anointing which constitutes the kingship of Christ, then to designate the Spirit as anointing is to affirm his royal, and by implication divine, status.¹³⁹ Here, in *Maced.*, Nyssen draws two conclusions from this link between anointing and kingship. First, the Son’s kingship is natural, not acquired. Second, the one with whom he is anointed must therefore be his “living, personal, subsistent kingship”.¹⁴⁰ Thus, the royal status of the Spirit is also natural and not acquired.¹⁴¹

¹³⁵ *Maced.* 13 (p.100.1-4,7-11; *PG* 45.1317A,B). See also Parmentier, “Doctrine” (1976), pp. 400-401.

¹³⁶ *Spir.* 20.51 (p. 103.27-28; *PG* 32.161C).

¹³⁷ See Nyssen’s treatment of this variant in his exposition of the Lord’s Prayer, *or. dom.* 3 (*PG* 44.1157C-1161A). G.W.H. Lampe [“The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke” in D.E. Nineham, ed., *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 169-170] and Robert Leaney [“The Lucan text of the Lord’s Prayer (Lk xi 2-4)”, *NT*, I (1956), 103-111] believe that this variant may well be Lucan in origin. On the other hand, Daniélou (“Chrismation”, pp. 183-184) argues that the variant was indigenous to Cappadocia and Pontus. See also the discussion by Parmentier, “Doctrine” (1976), pp. 428-434.

¹³⁸ Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 41; Daniélou, “Chrismation”, p. 180.

¹³⁹ *Trin.* (pp.15.15-16.21). This passage is not contained in the Migne edition. See also the discussion of this passage by Daniélou, “Chrismation”, pp. 178-181; Parmentier, “Doctrine” (1976), pp. 423-424.

¹⁴⁰ *Maced.* 16 (p.102.27-28; *PG* 45.1321A).

¹⁴¹ *Maced.* 16 (p.103.10-13; *PG* 45.1321B). See also the discussion by Daniélou, “Chrismation”, pp. 181-182.

Further evidence of the Spirit's divine glory is supplied by an examination of his activity in baptism. Focusing on the life that is imparted to the baptismal candidate,¹⁴² Gregory reasons that it could not come from the water, but must come from the Spirit, since, according to Jn 6:63, "it is the Spirit which gives life".¹⁴³ But the Spirit does not act alone in this regard, for this life-giving grace streams from the Father through the Son and is actualized by the Spirit.¹⁴⁴

The examination of these activities of the Spirit, together with the enumeration of his other attributes and activities,¹⁴⁵ reveals the adoration that is due to the Spirit as well as the majestic glory that belongs to him. Nyssen thus includes in his treatise a lengthy discussion of the worship of the Spirit, a matter which previous authors had not fully explored.¹⁴⁶ Here again the inconsistency of the Pneumatomachian position is apparent, for they conceded that worship is offered by men to the rulers of this world, but they refused to offer it to the Spirit.¹⁴⁷ Moreover, Gregory emphasizes that they cannot refer to Dt 6:13 ("Worship the Lord your God and him alone serve") to justify their position, even if they understand the Godhead to be composed of the Father and the Son.¹⁴⁸ For confession of the Son can be made only "in the Holy Spirit". Thus, the Spirit is inseparable from the Son, and the worship accorded the Son necessarily includes the Spirit.¹⁴⁹ For, Gregory continues:¹⁵⁰

It is unnatural for the one who thinks of the Father not to include the Son in his thought, and for the one who conceives of the Son not to include the Spirit together with the Son. In fact, if he completely rejects this confession and declares it to be invalid, then he is one of the Jews or Sadducees, since he denies the Son and does not accept the Holy Spirit. But if, in any way whatever, he professes to honour the beliefs of Christians, then undoubtedly

¹⁴² See the comments of Verhees, "'ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑΙ", pp. 15-16, 19. For a general discussion of Nyssen's view of the Spirit as "the giver of life", see Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1977), pp. 374-378, 381-384.

¹⁴³ *Maced.* 19 (p.105.19-30; *PG* 45.1324D-1325A).

¹⁴⁴ *Maced.* 19 (pp.105.30-106.24; *PG* 45.1325A-C). For a complete discussion of Nyssen's view of the Spirit's role in baptism, see Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1977), pp. 354-360.

¹⁴⁵ *Maced.* 22 (pp.108.18-109.15, 113.12-30; *PG* 45.1328C-1329B). The second passage (p. 113.12-20) is not contained in the Migne edition. See also the comments on these passages by Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 44, 46-47; Verhees, "'ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑΙ", pp.22-23.

¹⁴⁶ May, "Gregor von Nyssa", p. 126; De Halleux, "Profession", pp. 28-29.

¹⁴⁷ *Maced.* 24 (p.111.2-24; *PG* 45.1332B-D). See also Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 45; Verhees, "'ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑΙ", p. 22.

¹⁴⁸ *Maced.* 23 (p.110.17-25; *PG* 45.1332A). On this use of Dt 6:13, see Hauschild, "Pneumatomachian", pp. 69-70 and 69, n. 3.

¹⁴⁹ *Maced.* 24 (p.110.25-30; *PG* 45.1332A-B).

¹⁵⁰ *Maced.* (pp.113.26-114.5). See also the discussion of this passage by Daniélou, "Chrismation", pp. 192-193, 196-197.

when he thought of the Father he also thought of the one of whom he is the Father and when he conceived of the Son he had first been illuminated by the Spirit. 'For no one can say Jesus is Lord, except in the Holy Spirit' [1 Cor 12:3].

Thus, the Spirit is to be worshipped together with the Father and the Son, for, as "one power, one goodness, one life-giving authority, one Godhead, one life", all three are involved in man's redemption.¹⁵¹ In this concluding section, an important aspect of Gregory's pneumatology comes into view. Gregory's defence of the divinity of the Holy Spirit is more than simply the defence of a dogmatic formula. For outside of the Holy Spirit, true humanity, that is redeemed humanity, is impossible.¹⁵² This experiential aspect of Gregory's pneumatology is even more prominent in *ordin.*, a sermon given at the Council of Constantinople.

Although the philosophical argumentation in Nyssen's doctrinal works on the Holy Spirit is considerably more profound than that in his older brother's, Nyssen's doctrine of the Spirit is, at certain key points, noticeably dependent upon his brother's work. Consequently, Jaeger's remark that Basil's spirit "hovered" over the Council of Constantinople is indeed appropriate.¹⁵³ For, as will be seen, Nyssen played an influential role in the council's expansion of the pneumatological article of the Nicene creed. The council gathered in May, 381 and continued its discussions until the end of July, 381. During the council Nyssen is known to have preached two sermons: the funeral oration of Meletius, the first president of the council,¹⁵⁴ and *ordin.*, which is apparently a sermon given on the occasion of Gregory of Nazianzus' installation as the bishop of Constantinople. The date of the latter has been the subject of considerable debate. Daniélou¹⁵⁵ believed that it was given in May, 381, before the death of Meletius. Reinhart Staats¹⁵⁶ challenged this dating and argued for a much later one in 394. However, Staats'

¹⁵¹ *Maced.* (p.115.21-32).

¹⁵² See the comments of Hauschild, *Gottes Geist*, pp. 287-290; Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1977), pp. 378-381; Verhees, "ΕΝΕΠΙΕΙΑΙ", *passim*.

¹⁵³ *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 76. See also the remarks of Bolgiani, "Esprit Saint", p. 66.

¹⁵⁴ *Melet.* (pp. 441-457; PG 46.852A-864B).

¹⁵⁵ "La Chronologie des sermons de Grégoire de Nysse", *RSRel*, XXIX (1955), 357-358. See also Ernest Gebhardt, "Titel und Zeit der Rede Gregors von Nyssa 'In suam ordinationem'", *He*, LXXXIX (1961), 503-505; Bernardi, *Prédication*, p. 325. In his review of Ritter's book on the Council of Constantinople, Daniélou ["Bulletin d'histoire des origines chrétiennes: Adolf-Martin Ritter. *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*", *RSR*, LV (1967), 111] seems to have changed his mind, and held that the sermon was given when Nazianzen was president.

¹⁵⁶ "Die Asketen aus Mesopotamien in der Rede des Gregor von Nyssa 'In suam ordinationem'", *VChr*, XXI (1967), 165-179.

arguments received a convincing rebuttal from both May¹⁵⁷ and Ritter¹⁵⁸. May suggested that the oration was given towards the conclusion of the council of 381, shortly before the arrival of Ascholius of Thessalonica and Timothy of Alexandria at the end of June. Ritter, on the other hand, developed Loofs' suggestion that the sermon was given in May, 381, on the occasion of Nazianzen's installation as bishop of the capital of the eastern empire.¹⁵⁹ In his most recent contribution to the discussion, Staats has accepted Ritter's arguments,¹⁶⁰ which do indeed give the most satisfactory dating for the delivery of this sermon.¹⁶¹ Nevertheless, Ritter underestimates the important information that *ordin.* provides with regard to the discussions between the Pneumatomachi and the orthodox, which had ended in failure shortly before the sermon was given,¹⁶² and the role which certain charismatic ascetics played at the council.¹⁶³

An allusion to Ex 35:30-33 introduces the major theme of the sermon: through the divine Spirit Bezaleel, a man with no skill, became wise and was able to construct the Tabernacle.¹⁶⁴ The relevance of this story for Gregory lies in the fact that it demonstrates the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Expressly addressing the Pneumatomachi, Gregory asks:¹⁶⁵

When one calls the Holy Spirit divine, whose descent [into the soul] is as it were a footstep which imprints in the soul the gift of wisdom, does the use of the term 'divine' denigrate the dignity of the Spirit? Does this term suggest that the Spirit is to be regarded as something small and low or signify that he

¹⁵⁷ "Datierung", pp. 38-57. See also his "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 117-118. See Staats' response to May's article, "Die Datierung von 'In suam ordinationem' des Gregor von Nyssa", *VChr*, XXIII (1969), 58-59; *idem*, "Gregor von Nyssa und das Bischofsamt", *ZKG*, LXXXIV (1973), 171-172, n. 64.

¹⁵⁸ "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 308-328. See also Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1977), p. 413, n. 1110; De Halleux, "Profession", p. 23, n. 104.

¹⁵⁹ See Friedrich Loofs, "Gregory of Nyssa", *SHERK*, V (1909), 72.

¹⁶⁰ "Basilianische Verherrlichung", pp. 244-246, 251-252.

¹⁶¹ Ritter's view that the discussions with the Pneumatomachi took place under the aegis of Nazianzen (see p. 180, n. 73), therefore a few weeks or so later than *ordin.*, means that he has to maintain that *ordin.* makes no allusion to these discussions. But, as Danielou and May have shown (see n. 162 below) *ordin.* clearly presupposes the breakdown of the discussions between the Pneumatomachi and the orthodox.

¹⁶² See Daniélou, "Bulletin", pp. 110-113; May, "Datierung", pp. 38-57, *passim*.

¹⁶³ See Staats, "Basilianische Verherrlichung", pp. 244-246. See also Jean Gribomont, "Le Dossier des origines du Messalianisme" in Fontaine and Kannengiesser, eds., *EPEKTASIS*, p. 622; *idem*, "Saint Basile et le monachisme enthousiaste", *Ir*, LIII (1980), 143.

¹⁶⁴ *Ordin.* (p. 333.1-10; *PG* 46.545B). See May, "Datierung", pp. 39-40. Cf. the comments of Ritter, "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 327-328.

¹⁶⁵ *Ordin.* (pp. 333.11-334.4; *PG* 46.545B-D). In his investigation of the theology of Gregory of Nyssa's Pneumatomachian opponents, Hauschild ("Pneumatomachen", p. 76, n. 2) believes that, apart from *Maced.* and *Trin.*, Nyssen's other works provide little information. However, *ordin.*'s reports about the position taken by the Pneumatomachi on the Spirit are not without significance.

is a creature? Surely it is not to be supposed that the Spirit's divinity is acquired? And surely it is not to be thought that one who is simple and uncompounded has a twofold and composite nature? It is impossible to be in agreement with such opinions; in fact, the Spirit, who is undoubtedly divine, confesses that he is and is called divine by nature. Do you see how spontaneously the truth is revealed to you? Indeed, the kerygma of Christians does not know of many divine natures since that knowledge would require the invention of many gods. For it is impossible to conceive of many gods, when there is no mention of their different natures. Therefore, if it is believed by everyone that there is one divine nature, and since the Holy Spirit is divine by nature, why do you separate with words what is naturally united?

But the Pneumatomachi remain insensitive to the appeals of the orthodox Fathers of the council. What a different situation prevailed in the early Church when the words of the Apostle Peter brought thousands to salvation and into the fold of the Church! In fact, up until Gregory's generation love bound the Church together; but now, the bond of love has been broken.¹⁶⁶ Gregory demonstrates the way in which this bond of love has been broken by comparing the Pneumatomachi to the Prodigal Son. Like the Prodigal Son, they have taken their share of the godly inheritance handed down from the Apostles and squandered it upon "heretical prostitutes". But the orthodox believers are still willing to receive them back into fellowship: to clothe them in the beautiful robe of faith that was woven by the Fathers of Nicaea and to place upon their finger the ring which bears the seal of faith.¹⁶⁷ But their heart is hardened.

They refer to the same Fathers and yet do not receive the inheritance from them; they lay claim to that common noble descent and yet dissociate themselves from any relationship with us; they oppose our enemies but are hostile towards us; they stand as it were on the border between us and our enemies and belong at once to both sides and to neither side; they do not confess orthodox doctrine but refuse to be characterized as heretics.¹⁶⁸

This text clearly portrays the "middle position" which many of the Pneumatomachi loved to occupy. On the one hand, those addressed by Nyssen considered the Nicene confession with regard to the Father and the Son a sound document of faith. Thus, they rejected the position of the Anomoeans and Arians. These Pneumatomachi may very well have defended their orthodoxy by an appeal to Liberius' acceptance of

¹⁶⁶ *Ordin.* (p. 334.4-21; *PG* 46.545D-548A).

¹⁶⁷ *Ordin.* (pp. 335.11-336.8; *PG* 46.548C-D). Daniélou ("Bulletin", p.111) and May ("Datierung", p. 54 and n. 76) regard the reference to the "ring which has the seal of faith engraved on it" as an allusion to the expanded third article of the Nicene creed, which they believe was drawn up in the attempt to persuade the Pneumatomachi to unite with the orthodox.

¹⁶⁸ *Ordin.* (p. 336.10-17; *PG* 46.548D-549A).

Eustathius, Silvanus of Tarsus and Theophilus of Castabala in 366 after they had indicated their full agreement with the Nicene creed.¹⁶⁹ Clearly Eleusius of Cyzicus is not in view at this point, since he had never accepted the Nicene creed.¹⁷⁰ Nevertheless, not all of the Pneumatomachi were of the stamp of Eleusius, as the sermons of Gregory of Nazianzus reveal. On the other hand, these Pneumatomachi refused to follow the Neo-Nicenes in the conclusions which the latter drew from the Nicene creed with regard to the Holy Spirit.¹⁷¹ But, warns Gregory, according to the evangelist John sentence has already been passed on such indecision: those who are neither hot nor cold will be spewed out of the mouth of God.¹⁷²

After this warning, Gregory returns to his theme by once again contrasting the results that were produced by the preaching of the early Church with those that follow the preaching of his day.

What is responsible for the fact that formerly in the days of the disciples many people were brought into the Church by the Lord, but nowadays the lengthy and splendid addresses of [Christian] teachers go in one ear and out the other without being turned into action? Perhaps someone will say that at that time the apostles were helped by the miracles they accomplished and that their preaching carried conviction through the gifts of grace. I also hold that mighty acts have a great power to convince. Yet what should we make of what is happening nowadays? Do you not see similar wonders of the faith? I consider the deeds of our fellow-servants as works of faith, since, by following the same Spirit, they bear witness to the truth of Christian preaching by the power of healings. These men come from foreign parts, fellow-countrymen of our father Abraham, who have ventured forth from Mesopotamia. Like him, they have left their native country, their family ties — indeed the whole world. Their gaze is fixed on heaven. They are distinctively alien from ordinary life, they rise above human emotions, and they take only as much part in this life as is necessary. For the most part they converse with the incorporeal powers above. In outward appearance, they are elderly, but honourable to see with their glistening white hair and their mouths silent and closed. They do not know how to fight with words, because they have not studied rhetoric. They have such power against the spiritual forces of evil that with a single command they conquer falsehood and expel demons, not with the techniques of syllogism but with the power of faith. The demons are not driven to a place from which they cannot counterattack; they are banished to outer darkness. That is the kind of syllogism a Christian knows how to make! These are our deeds of faith! Why then are we not convinced, when the grace of healings increases, when the teaching of our sermons abounds, for ‘the one and the same Spirit produces all these things, distributing to each one as he wills’ [1 Cor 12:11]? Why then is the number of the saved not greater? However, let no one imagine

¹⁶⁹ May, “Datierung”, p. 51 and n. 63.

¹⁷⁰ On Eleusius, see pp. 177-179.

¹⁷¹ Ritter, “Gregor von Nyssa, p. 321.

¹⁷² *Ordin.* (p.337.1-7; PG 46.549A-B).

that I consider the grace of our present age as small. I see the vine flourishing with thriving branches and abundant fruit. I see the land swelling with many ears of corn: wide is the harvest, plentiful the sheaves, luxuriant the crop.¹⁷³

Who are these “Mesopotamian” ascetics, whose lifestyle Nyssen finds so worthy of commendation? Staats has shown that they were probably ascetics whose theological opinions were akin to those of Macarius-Symeon.¹⁷⁴ In the struggle between the Neo-Nicene party and the Pneumatomachi, Macarius-Symeon would undoubtedly have taken the side of the Neo-Nicenes, since he too regarded as a fundamental axiom the belief that the natures of the Spirit and creatures are radically different. Yet, the heart of his pneumatology lay elsewhere. His reflections upon his own experience as a monk made him aware not only of the extent to which men and women are enslaved to sin, but also of their total inability to escape this bondage. He came to the conclusion that it is only through the power of the indwelling Spirit that men and women can begin to shake off the fetters of this enslavement. An excellent summary of Macarius-Symeon’s doctrine of the Spirit is provided by Dörries’ statement that, for Macarius-Symeon, the Holy Spirit is “the Saviour from the overwhelming power of evil, against which man cannot defend himself”.¹⁷⁵

Staats finds confirmation of his opinion about the identity of these “Mesopotamian” ascetics in a parable which Nyssen relates at the end of his sermon. Despite the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit by these ascetics, the Pneumatomachi, and other heretical groups such as the Anomoeans, remain hostile to the position of the Neo-Nicenes.¹⁷⁶ However, Gregory is not depressed by this situation, for he is encouraged by the statement of Mt 5:6: “Blessed are those who thirst after the Lord”. A graphic illustration of the implications of this statement is offered by the parable about the thirsty traveller who is walking at midday on a dusty road under the scorching rays of the sun. When he comes upon a bubbling spring, does he, asks Gregory, sit down to speculate about the

¹⁷³ *Ordin.* (pp.337.7-338.18; PG 46.549B-D). Trans. Staats, “Basilianische Verherrlichung”, pp. 244-245, revised. See also the discussion of this passage by Parmentier, “Doctrines” (1977), pp. 423-426; Staats, “Basilianische Verherrlichung”, pp. 244-246; Verhees, “ΕΝΕΠΤΕΙΑΙ”, pp. 27-28.

¹⁷⁴ “Basilianische Verherrlichung”, pp. 242-246. See also his “Asketen”, pp. 168-173.
¹⁷⁵ *Theologie*, p. 435. For a complete discussion of Macarius-Symeon’s pneumatology, see *ibid.*, pp. 198-335. See also the comments by Staats, “Basilianische Verherrlichung”, pp. 239-241; *idem*, “Literarische Berichte und Anzeigen: Hermann Dörries: *Die Theologie des Makarios/Symeon*”, ZKG, XCI (1980), 399-400; S.G. Hall, “Reviews: *Die Theologie des Makarios/ Symeon*. By Hermann Dörries”, JEH, XXXII (1981), 85.

¹⁷⁶ *Ordin.* (pp.338.18-339.26; PG 46.549D-552C). See also May, “Datierung”, p. 40.

nature and origin of the water? Of course not! He quickly bends down to drink the water and assuage his burning thirst. Thus, Gregory exhorts his audience not to follow the Pneumatomachi in their futile theological speculation, but to imitate the thirsty man.¹⁷⁷

When you learn how many good gifts the Holy Spirit produces in abundance, do as the prophet said: 'Open your mouth and draw in the Spirit' [Ps 118:131 (LXX)]. Open your mouth wide and the one who has the power over the gifts of grace will fill it. Do you want to know how many good gifts flow from the source of the Spirit? Incorruptibility of soul, eternal life, the kingdom of heaven, infinite gladness, joy without end.¹⁷⁸

What is remarkable is that the same parable occurs in *hom.* 12.12 of Macarius-Symeon with a similar application.

Eat as much bread as you find and let go of the rest of the whole world; go to the edge of the river and drink as much as you need, and continue on your way. Do not seek to know from where it comes or how it flows. Make every effort to have your foot healed or the disease of your eye, so that you may see the light of the sun. But do not seek to know how much light the sun has or how high it rises.¹⁷⁹

Through the use of this parable, both Nyssen and Macarius/Symeon reject a theology which is purely speculative and lacking an experiential focus. Instead, both authors urge their contemporaries to find true satisfaction through a personal appropriation of the Spirit and his gifts. Gregory's use of this parable, as well as his praise for the ascetics from Mesopotamia, reveals the influence that charismatic and ascetic groups of a pre-Messalian nature had upon the thought of the bishop of Nyssa.¹⁸⁰ In fact, it is on the basis of Gregory's use of this parable that Gilles Quispel has claimed that Nyssen's message to the theologians of his day was: "do not speculate about inner-trinitarian relations, but drink in the Spirit".¹⁸¹ Although Quispel may have overstated his case, religious and charismatic experience is clearly a key factor in Nyssen's formulation of a doctrine of the Spirit.¹⁸²

Consequently, this sermon reveals Gregory to be a key figure among

¹⁷⁷ *Ordin.* (p.340.1-20; *PG* 46.552C-553A).

¹⁷⁸ *Ordin.* (pp.340.21-341.5; *PG* 46.553A-B).

¹⁷⁹ P.113.137-141; *PG* 34.564B-C.

¹⁸⁰ See Staats, "Asketen", pp. 170-172; Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1977), pp. 413-414.

¹⁸¹ "Gregorius van Nyssa en de mystiek", *NTT*, XXIV (1969-1970), 253-255.

¹⁸² Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1977), pp. 424-426. See also the statement of Jaeger [*Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 95] that Gregory and his brother Peter of Sebaste "believed in the divine inspiration of the prophets and apostles because such inspiration was a reality that they knew from their own experience".

those bishops of the council who genuinely sought to convince the Pneumatomachian delegation of the error of their ways. Although Gregory was grieved by the failure of these discussions, he was both cheered and influenced by the presence in the Church of certain charismatic ascetics from "Mesopotamia". The lives of these ascetics provided not only a living demonstration of the divinity of the Spirit, but also an indication of where the believer's priorities should lie. Finally, as Ritter observes,¹⁸³ *ordin.* may indicate indirectly the cool relationship which existed between Nyssen and Nazianzen during the council. For it is strange that this sermon, given on the occasion of Nazianzen's installation as bishop of Constantinople, makes no reference to Nazianzen. However, the sermon does not confirm Jaeger's belief that Nyssen was the author of the expanded pneumatological article of the Nicene creed.¹⁸⁴ Such evidence must be sought elsewhere.

In his work, published posthumously, on Gregory's teaching on the Holy Spirit, Jaeger finds such evidence in two particular sources. The first, *Cod. Thds.* 16.1.3, is an edict which was published on July 30, 381 in order to confirm the dogmatic conclusions of the Council of Constantinople.¹⁸⁵ This edict, an administrative measure drawn up by the emperor and the council, sought to safeguard the orthodoxy of the catholic Church by designating eleven bishops, including Diodore of Tarsus, Amphilochius of Iconium, and Nyssen, as the guarantors of orthodox belief.¹⁸⁶ In order to be regarded as orthodox one had to be in communion with these bishops. Jaeger regards the inclusion of Nyssen's name in this edict as an indication of the prominent position which he held in the theological discussions of the council.¹⁸⁷ In fact, Jaeger is of the opinion that the eleven bishops named in this edict actually comprised the doctrinal committee which drew up C.¹⁸⁸ The second source to which Jaeger turns for evidence of Nyssen's authorship of the third article of C is the report of the fourteenth-century Byzantine historian Nicephorus Callistus. According to this report, Nyssen completed the Nicene creed in such a way that the same honour and glory was accorded the Holy Spirit as the Father and the Son.¹⁸⁹ Moreover, in Jaeger's opinion, an

¹⁸³ "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 326, n. 97; 328, n. 108. For a similar judgment, see Daniélou, "Bulletin", p. 112.

¹⁸⁴ *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 51-77. See also his "Gregor, 6. Bischof von Nyssa", *RGK*, II (1958), 1845.

¹⁸⁵ P. 834.1-15.

¹⁸⁶ *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 56-59.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 60-62.

¹⁸⁹ *PG* 146.784A-B.

examination of Gregory's pneumatology in *Maced.* confirms the judgment which he bases upon these two sources. For the various elements of the pneumatological article of C are all emphasized in Gregory's *Maced.*¹⁹⁰

While Daniélou¹⁹¹ has welcomed Jaeger's suggestion that Nyssen was the author of the pneumatological article of C, May¹⁹² is more hesitant, and André de Halleux¹⁹³ quite sceptical. De Halleux regards it as somewhat hasty to conclude that the bishops listed in *Cod. Thds.* 16.1.3 are the doctrinal committee which drew up C. Moreover, Nyssen does not even have a prominent place in this list of bishops.¹⁹⁴ May, on the other hand, does not consider the late report of Nicephorus as persuasive evidence for Gregory's authorship of the third article.¹⁹⁵ Finally, both May¹⁹⁶ and De Halleux¹⁹⁷ point out that it is impossible to prove Nyssen's authorship by recourse to the parallels between the statements of the pneumatological article of the creed drawn up by the Council of Constantinople and Nyssen's dogmatic works, specifically *Maced.* The concepts and key-terms used in the article were drawn from an arsenal which was common to many of the fourth-century authors who wrote against the Pneumatomachi.

Despite the fact that there is no one source which unequivocally identifies Nyssen as the theologian responsible for the pneumatological article of C, it would not be unreasonable to assume that Gregory took a leading role in the drafting of this article.¹⁹⁸ For the fact that he preached at the installation of his namesake as bishop of Constantinople and at the funeral of Meletius reveals the esteem in which he was held by both the council and the emperor.¹⁹⁹ The edict of July 30, 381 is a further attestation of this esteem, as well as the fact that in the official list of the Cappadocian bishops who participated in the council, his name appears immediately after that of his metropolitan, Helladius.²⁰⁰ Furthermore,

¹⁹⁰ *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 66-71.

¹⁹¹ "Bulletin d'histoire des origines chrétiennes: Werner Jaeger. *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom Der Heilige Geist*", *RSR*, LV (1967), 116-118.

¹⁹² "Datierung", pp. 54-57.

¹⁹³ "Profession", pp. 21-22.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁹⁵ "Datierung", pp. 54-55. See also the judgment of Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 197, n. 1. However, cf. Staats, "Basilianische Verherrlichung", pp. 242-243 and 243, n. 45.

¹⁹⁶ "Datierung", p. 57.

¹⁹⁷ "Profession", p. 22.

¹⁹⁸ May, "Datierung", pp. 55-57.

¹⁹⁹ Jaeger, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 74-75; May, "Gregor von Nyssa", pp. 116-118.

²⁰⁰ May, "Gregor von Nyssa", p. 118. For a different opinion, see De Halleux, "Profession", p. 22.

the reserved nature of the pneumatology of C is what could be expected from one who had drunk deeply from the well of Basilian pneumatology. Like his brother, Nyssen never uses the term “one in being” to denote the Spirit’s relationship to the Father and the Son.²⁰¹ And his refusal to consider the term “God” as an indication of the Spirit’s nature, could reflect a desire to avoid the use of this term in the discussion about the Spirit’s divine status.²⁰² Thus, it is not at all improbable that Gregory of Nyssa was the author of the reserved pneumatological statement of the creed issued by the Council of Constantinople, a statement which is nonetheless an unequivocal confession of the deity of the Spirit. If this is the case, it was indeed appropriate that a theologian, whose theology of the Spirit was indebted to Athanasius as well as to Basil, should have drawn up the following statement, which can be regarded as the triumph of that pneumatological position for which both Athanasius and Basil had struggled:²⁰³

[We believe] in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life, who proceeds from the Father, who is worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who spoke through the prophets.

²⁰¹ Parmentier, “Doctrine” (1976), p. 390.

²⁰² Parmentier, “Doctrine” (1976), pp. 392-393. See also May, “Datierung”, p. 56.

²⁰³ Pp. 248.13-250.16. For a comparison of Athanasius’ and Basil’s pneumatologies with that of C see Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 124-125 and Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto*, pp. 174-176 respectively.

EXCURSUS FOUR

THE DATE OF THE DELIVERY OF GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS' OR. 41

Although J.T. Cummings¹ is critical of Gustave Bardy's and J.-R. Palanque's view of the location of the discussions between the Pneumatomachi and the orthodox in the sequence of events at the Council of Constantinople,² he reproduces their error concerning the date of *or.* 41. Bardy and Palanque date *or.* 41 at Pentecost, 381 and leave the reader with the impression that Gregory delivered this oration at the time of the Council of Constantinople.³ Cummings comments on this impression:⁴

The reference to Gregory's forty-first Oration is irrelevant since it is not clear whether Pentecost preceded or followed the opening session; it is not even certain that this oration was written for the Pentecost of 381, although it seems the most probable date.

Gallay,⁵ however, has pointed out that *or.* 41 cannot be dated from 381, since this date would place it later than both *or.* 34 (delivered in the spring of 380⁶) and *or.* 31 (delivered in July-November, 380⁷). The latter orations manifest a more severe view of the Pneumatomachi than that contained in *or.* 41. In *or.* 41 Gregory is still prepared to regard the Pneumatomachi as erring brothers. In *or.* 41.8 he writes:⁸

Confess that the Trinity is one in Godhead, gentlemen, or if you wish, one in nature; and we shall ask the Spirit to give you the term 'God'. For I am sure that he will give it to you, since he has given [it] to you [as the name for] the first and the second [persons],⁹ especially if our contention involves a certain

¹ "A Critical Edition of the Carmen de vita sua of St. Gergory Nazianzen" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1966), pp. 160-161.

² On the time of these discussions, see p. 180.

³ *De la paix constantinienne à la mort de Théodose*, vol. 3 of Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin, eds., *Histoire de l'église* ([Paris]: Bloud & Gay, 1947), pp. 286-287. Dörries (*De Spiritu Sancto*, p. 27), Thomas Michels [*Gregor von Nazianz. Macht des Mysteriums* (Alte Quellen neuer Kraft, vol. 1; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1956), p. 125], and Simonetti (*Crisi ariana*, pp. 530-531, n. 11) also think that *or.* 41 was delivered before *or.* 31.

⁴ "Critical Edition", p. 160.

⁵ *Vie*, pp. 148-149; *idem*, "Grégoire de Nazianze: Sermon pour le jour de la Pentecôte", *VS*, LXVIII(1943), 544, n. 1.

⁶ See excursus V.

⁷ See p. 175, n. 35.

⁸ *PG* 36.440B-C.

⁹ Δώσει γὰρ, εὖ οἶδα, ὁ τὸ πρῶτον δοῦς, καὶ τὸ δεῦτερον. C.G. Browne and J.E. Swallow

spiritual timidity, and not a diabolical opposition. ...For we are not seeking to conquer, but to gain brothers, from whom we are torn asunder. This we say to you, among whom we find some lively faith (τὴ καὶ ζωτικόν), since you are sound with regard to the Son; although we admire your lifestyle we do not entirely commend your doctrine. You who have the gifts of the Spirit, receive then also the Spirit, that you might not simply strive, but strive lawfully, since lawful striving is the condition for your crown. May this reward be granted to you for your way of life, to perfectly confess the Spirit, and to proclaim with us, and even before us,¹⁰ so far as it is meet. I dare something even greater for your sake,[namely] to utter that saying of the Apostle. So much do I cleave to you...that I would choose even to be separated from Christ [cf. Rom 9:3] and to suffer as one who is condemned, if only you might stand with us, and we might glorify the Trinity publicly.

By contrast, in the following year, Gregory considered the Pneumatomachian heresy an unbearable blasphemy,¹¹ whose adherents were estranged from God.¹² In Gregory's eyes, they occupied the second highest rung on the ladder of impiety, after the Eunomians.¹³ It is highly unlikely that Gregory's attitude towards the Pneumatomachi became milder with the passage of time,¹⁴ especially since Gregory enjoyed imperial support in the final months of his sojourn at Constantinople,¹⁵ and the Pneumatomachi had proven so intransigent in their views. Ritter ascribes the shift in

[*Select Orations and Letters of St. Gregory Nazianzen* (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 7; New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1894) p. 381, n.t.] interpret τὸ πρῶτον and τὸ δεύτερον as "the Consubstantiality and Unity of the Trinity" respectively. Yet, there is nothing in the text to warrant such an interpretation. Further on in *or.* 41.8 (*PG* 36.440B) Gregory will say that the Pneumatomachi among his hearers are "sound with regard to the Son" (τοὺς τὸν υἱὸν ὀμολογούσιν.). In light of this, it is most probable that here Gregory means that these Pneumatomachi are quite prepared to confess the Father and the Son as divine, but refuse to ascribe divinity to the Spirit. See Hauschild, "Pneumatomachen", p. 86.

¹⁰ At the time when Gregory spoke these words, the Neo-Nicene party had not openly declared the Spirit to be God. Gregory is thus encouraging the Pneumatomachi to take the lead in the open confession of the Spirit's deity.

¹¹ *Or.* 34.11 (*PG* 36.252B).

¹² *Or.* 34.9 (*PG* 36.249B). On the date of *or.* 34, see excursus IV.

¹³ *Or.* 31.13 (p.300.8; *PG* 36.148C).

¹⁴ See Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 77.

¹⁵ It is important to remember that it was almost certainly because of Gregory's influence that Theodosius ruled, in January, 381, that the denial of the divinity of the Spirit was heretical. The relevant portion of this proclamation is cited in Ritter, *Konzil*, p. 77, n. 4. See also Meinhold, "Pneumatomachoi", col. 1086. In February, 380 Theodosius had also issued the edict, *Cod. Thds.* 16.1.2 and addressed it to the people of Constantinople. This edict stated that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are to be worshipped in equal majesty as one Godhead (see King, *Theodosius*, pp. 28-29). Gregory would certainly have known of its existence, despite the fact that he hardly mentions it (see p. 178). Thus, in the years 380 and 381 Gregory would have been assured, to some extent, of imperial support for his position on the Holy Spirit; yet, see pp. 179-181. However, in 379, Gregory was not prepared to totally alienate those Pneumatomachi whose beliefs were sound with regard to the Son [*or.* 41.8 (*PG* 36.440B)], and who, although they did not confess the Spirit to be God [*or.* 41.7-8 (*PG* 36.437D-440B)], nevertheless did not consider the Spirit to be a creature [*or.* 41.6-7 (*PG* 36.437A-C)].

Gregory's attitude towards the Pneumatomachi partly to the increased influence by Eleusius of Cyzicus and his followers upon the Pneumatomachi of Constantinople.¹⁶

Bernardi finds conclusive proof for dating *or.* 41 in the year 379 from two passages in which Gregory refers to the tribulations the orthodox must endure for correct doctrine.¹⁷ In *or.* 41.5, Gregory states:¹⁸

Even now he [God] suffers many things: he endures the lack of respect from the enemies of Christ, for he is longsuffering. But from the lovers of Christ he receives honour. And even as in their case he defers his wrath, so in ours he delays his kindness. On the one hand, he possibly gives to them time for repentance, and on the other, he proves our love, unless we faint in our tribulations and struggles on behalf of the orthodox faith.

Gregory would not have uttered such sentiments when he was officially established as bishop of Constantinople. When these words were spoken, the Arians under Demophilus clearly still retained their power in Constantinople; therefore the year 381 must be absolutely excluded from consideration in dating *or.* 41.¹⁹

Bernardi also refers to *or.* 41.14:²⁰

Today, this one [the Holy Spirit] makes even me his bold herald to you. If therefore I suffer nothing, thanks be to God; but if I do suffer, thanks be to God in that case as well. The former would occur that he might spare those who hate me. And the latter that he might sanctify me, when I receive this as a reward for the holy work of [preaching] the Gospel, even my perfection through blood.

Gregory would not have expressed such fears of martyrdom in 381, when he would have been assured of imperial protection.²¹ And in 380, although the situation was still uncertain for the orthodox community in Constantinople, it was not as dangerous as it had been in 379. Nor is Gregory indulging in hyperbole when he refers to his possible martyrdom for the truth, for at Easter of 379 he had narrowly escaped being stoned by the Arians.²² Thus Pentecost, 379 has to be the occasion when Gregory delivered this sermon.

¹⁶ *Konzil*, p. 77.

¹⁷ *Prédication*, p. 158.

¹⁸ *PG* 36.436C.

¹⁹ Gallay, *Vie*, p. 148; Bernardi, *Prédication*, p. 158.

²⁰ *PG* 36.448D-449A.

²¹ See p. 179.

²² Both Gallay (*Vie*, p. 148) and Bernardi (*Prédication*, p. 158) see an allusion to this stoning in Gregory's statement that Christ was stoned "for us, to whom he had to give an example (τύπον) of endurance under hardship (κακοπαθείας) on behalf of the faith" [*or.* 41.5 (*PG* 36.436B)]. The context in which Gregory uses the term κακοπαθεία probably also contains an allusion to the sole occurrence of this word in the New Testament, Jas 5:10. There, the believers are encouraged to take those prophets who spoke in the Lord's name as "an example (ὑποδείγμα) of endurance under hardship (κακοπαθείας) and patience".

EXCURSUS FIVE

THE DATE OF THE DELIVERY OF GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS' *OR.* 34

Or. 34 was given on the occasion of the arrival of a group of Alexandrian sailors, who had brought not only a convoy of wheat to Constantinople,¹ but also, it seems, letters of reconciliation from Peter of Alexandria to Nazianzen.² Peter had for a brief time supported the claims of Maximus, the usurper of the see of Constantinople.³ Later, Peter realized his error of judgment, and now desired reconciliation.

Or. 34 is particularly hard to date.⁴ Gallay dates it between February and July of 380.⁵ In this case, it would have been prior to the theological orations (*or.* 27-31).⁶ Gallay's dating is accepted by Ritter, who speaks of a change in Nazianzen's position towards the Pneumatomachi from *or.* 41 to *or.* 34, and especially, to *or.* 31.⁷ J.M. Szymusiak places the oration in June, 380, but he differs from Gallay and Ritter in believing that the theological orations preceded *or.* 34.⁸ On the other hand, Bernardi believes *or.* 34 to have been given in the late summer or autumn of 380.⁹ This dating is essentially the same as that proposed by the Maurist editors,¹⁰ which Hauschild also follows.¹¹

It seems particularly clear from the oration itself that it is subsequent to Maximus' attempt to have himself installed as bishop of Constantinople.¹² Evidence for this conclusion is provided by the first half of the

¹ *Or.* 34.1,7 (*PG* 36.242A-B, 248A-B). The ideal time for sailing on the Mediterranean was between May 26 and September 14. Merchant ships, however, would sometimes risk sailing in the periods of March 11 to May 26 and September 15 to November 11, when the weather was more doubtful. See W.M. Ramsey, "Roads and Travel (in NT)", *HDB*, V (1904), 376, 381.

² Szymusiak, "Chronologie", p. 187.

³ See p. 179.

⁴ Mossay, "Gregor von Nazianz", p. 232.

⁵ *Vie*, pp. 171-173. See also Dagron, *Naissance*, p. 448, n. 7.

⁶ See p. 175, n. 35.

⁷ *Konzil*, pp. 76-77.

⁸ "Chronologie", pp. 187-188.

⁹ *Prédication*, p. 176.

¹⁰ *PG* 36.237-240.

¹¹ "Pneumatomachen", p. 87. However, neither Hauschild nor Bernardi maintain that the theological orations preceded *or.* 34, as Szymusiak does.

¹² Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IX, 713-714; Gallay, *Vie*, p. 172; Bernardi, *Prédication*, p. 177.

oration which concerns the reconciliation between Gregory and Peter of Alexandria, who had supported Maximus' claims for a brief period of time.¹³ The question is then: what is the *terminus ante quem* of *or.* 34? The oration was certainly given before the orthodox re-occupation of the churches of Constantinople following Theodosius' entry into the city in November, 380.¹⁴

In his discussion of *or.* 34, Bernardi does not appear to give any reasons for the approximate date that he assigns to the oration.¹⁵ Gallay, however, gives two major reasons for his earlier dating. First, despite the fact that Gregory and Peter are reconciled to one another, the situation of the orthodox community in Constantinople remains precarious.¹⁶ In section 7 of this oration, Gregory alludes to the fact that his congregation is quite small. He says to the Egyptian sailors:¹⁷

You did not go to the many and mingle with them, nor did you measure the orthodox faith by the multitude.

Such language, Gallay argues, is quite different from the triumphant tone of his theological orations, given later that year.

Second, there is Nazianzen's obvious effort in the first half of the oration to show that his trinitarian theology conformed to that of Peter, the brother and successor of Athanasius.¹⁸ Gallay reasons that Gregory would not have made such an attempt if the oration had not been given soon after Theodosius' edict of February 28, 380, which recognized as orthodox only those who were in communion with the bishop of Alexandria and Damasus of Rome.¹⁹ According to Gallay, then, the first half of *or.* 34 is designed to show that Nazianzen complies with the stipulations laid down in this edict.²⁰

Nevertheless, the fact that this edict serves as a backdrop for *or.* 34.1-

¹³ Gallay, *Vie*, pp. 172-173; Bernardi, *Prédication*, p. 177; Szymusiak, "Chronologie", pp. 187-188.

¹⁴ Gallay, *Vie*, p. 172, who cites *or.* 34.7 (PG 36.248B) as proof.

¹⁵ *Prédication*, pp. 176-177.

¹⁶ *Vie*, p. 173.

¹⁷ PG 36.248B. Cf. *or.* 34.2 (PG 36.241C-244A). See also Tillemont, *Mémoires*, IX, 714.

¹⁸ *Or.* 34.1-7 (PG 36.241A-248C).

¹⁹ *Vie*, p. 173. See also King, *Theodosius*, p. 28.

²⁰ If this is the case, King (*Theodosius*, p. 29) is not entirely correct when he says: "St. Gregory Nazianzen, struggling for the Nicene cause, does not so much as mention it [i.e., the edict]." Furthermore, if Bernardi (*Prédication*, p. 165) is correct in his dating of *or.* 33 (after February 28, 380), then Nazianzen's remark in *or.* 33.13 (PG 36.229D) to the effect that he, unlike the Arian clergy of Constantinople, had never disobeyed an "imperial edict" (βασιλικὸν δόγμα), is plainly a reference to the edict of February 28. On the dating of *or.* 33, see p. 174, n. 34.

7 does not necessarily mean that the oration was given soon after February 28. For instance, Bernardi rightly maintains that Gregory is clearly preoccupied with affirming publicly that he and Peter agree in their trinitarian doctrine, because the edict had named Peter a guarantor of orthodoxy. Yet, Bernardi also believes that the oration was given in the late summer or fall of 380.²¹

Nonetheless, Gallay's earlier dating is to be preferred, because of Nazianzen's reference to the uncertain situation that still existed for the orthodox community in Constantinople, despite the emperor's ruling in February.²² It would seem that as the year progressed, the situation became more secure for the orthodox community. *Or.* 34 was thus given in the late spring or early summer of 380.

²¹ *Prédication*, pp. 176-177. Bernardi also notes that in the second half of the oration [*or.* 34.8-15 (*PG* 36.248D-256B)], which is an exposition of trinitarian theology, Nazianzen devotes only twenty-three lines to both the Father and the Son, but ninety lines to the Spirit. For the significance of this fact, see pp. 179-180, n. 66.

²² This may be another reason why Nazianzen says almost nothing about the edict of February 28, 380 (yet, see pp. 178-179). The edict did little to change the immediate situation for the Nicene community in Constantinople.

CONCLUSION

A fuller appreciation of the pneumatological exegesis of 1 and 2 Cor by Athanasius and Basil in the struggle over the question of the Holy Spirit's nature and status can be obtained by going back to the exegesis of these letters by Origen, with whom this study began and who has rightly been recognized as the fountainhead of the Greek exegetical tradition. By this means, it can be clearly seen how pneumatological thought and the exegesis supporting that thought moved from the third century to the latter half of the fourth century.

The turmoil which erupted in the latter half of the fourth century over the question of the Holy Spirit's nature and status can be indirectly traced to the failure of Origen to provide the Church, especially in the eastern Roman Empire, with an adequate doctrine of the Spirit. His doctrine of the Spirit, like other aspects of his teaching, is fraught with tension. On the one hand, the Spirit's existence as an individual entity within the Godhead is defended and his eternal and substantial possession of all the divine attributes affirmed. On the other hand, the Spirit is declared to be the creation, albeit eternal, of the Son and ranked third in a Godhead which was probably conceived as consisting of different gradations of being.¹ Once the metaphysical supports for this concept were rejected,² Origen's pneumatology inevitably devolved into the Arian affirmation of the Spirit as a member, not of the Godhead, but of the created realm.

An excellent illustration of the tension in Origen's pneumatology is offered by his interpretation of 1 Cor 2:10. In *princ.* 4.4.8³ Origen asserts that the uncreated nature of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is revealed by the fact that the divine nature is not comprehended by any creature. Allusions to Mt 11:27 and 1 Cor 2:10 support this assertion. However, in his treatise on prayer, Origen writes:⁴

We can not even sing and hymn the Father in Christ with proper rhythm, melody, measure, and harmony unless the Spirit who searches everything, even the depths of God [1 Cor 2:10], first praises and hymns him whose depths he has searched and understood as far as he is able.

¹ See pp. 9-18; 11, n. 14.

² For details of this rejection, see Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", pp. 195-201. See also Otis, "Cappadocian Thought", pp. 101-105, 118-120.

³ P. 420.299-311; PG 11.409B-D.

⁴ *Or.* 2.4 (p. 302.2-6; PG 11.421A-B). Trans. Greer, *Origen*, p.85.

Taken literally the phrase “as far as he is able” indicates that the Spirit’s knowledge of the Father is limited. A harmonization of this passage with that noted above from *princ.* may be possible,⁵ but the tension between the two is obvious. However, other citations by Origen of 1 Cor 2:10 and the following verse reveal that he was principally interested in them because they were a valuable testimony to the fact that the Spirit, who searches the depths of God, possesses all of the qualifications needed to lead the believer to a deeper knowledge of God.⁶ This latter understanding of 1 Cor 2:10-11 proved to be of service to Basil, who, faced with the Pneumatomachian denial of the Spirit’s divinity, took Origen’s exposition to its logical conclusion: since the Spirit reveals truths about God, and because God is known fully by God alone, the Spirit must be divine.

Elsewhere, Origen sees in 1 Cor 2:11 valuable support for his belief that the human spirit is a fundamental component of every man’s being.⁷ As far as 1 Cor 2:12 is concerned, Origen prefers to cite only the last part of the verse: “that we might know the gifts freely bestowed upon us by God”. Frequently, he dovetails this part of 1 Cor 2:12 with 1 Cor 2:16, and interprets the resulting conflation in a manner very similar to his usual exposition of 1 Cor 2:10-11. For instance, in *princ.* 4.2.3, Origen writes:⁸

Does not an inner meaning, the Lord’s meaning, lie hidden there [that is, in the Gospels] that is revealed only by that grace he received who said, ‘But we have the mind of Christ...that we might understand the gifts bestowed upon us by God. And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit’ [1 Cor 2:16, 12-13]?

Upon examination, Origen’s exegesis of the other texts from the Corinthian correspondence which have a prominent place in Athanasius’ and Basil’s defence of the Spirit’s divinity reveals not only the peculiarities of his concept of the Spirit, but also the fact that his interest in these texts is usually quite different from that of Athanasius and Basil. 1 Cor 12:3, for instance, is offered as proof in *princ.* 1.3.7 that the Spirit’s activity is restricted to the saints of God, whereas that of the Son encompasses the entire rational creation and that of the Father extends to all of the created realm.⁹ Corresponding to this concept of the different spheres of

⁵ See the solution offered by J.E.L. Oulton and Henry Chadwick, trans., *Alexandrian Christianity* (The Library of Christian Classics, vol. 2; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), pp. 332-333.

⁶ See *Cels.* 6.17 (pp.220.14 - 222.44; *PG* 11.1316C-1317A); *Comm. in Mt.* 14.6 (p.288.5-25; *PG* 13.1196C-1197A).

⁷ *Dial.* 7 (p.70.5-14).

⁸ P. 306.81-86; *PG* 11.361B. Trans. Greer, *Origen*, p. 181.

⁹ P. 158.226-230; *PG* 11.153B.

operation which hold among the members of the Godhead is Origen's conception of the hierarchical structure of that Godhead, which has been described above. The latter concept can be traced back ultimately to the Middle Platonist view of reality as hierarchical in essence. Of course, after Nicaea, which drew a sharp line between the Godhead and the created realm,¹⁰ this interpretation of 1 Cor 12:3 was unacceptable. Nevertheless, Origen's restriction of the Spirit's activity to the sphere of the Church can be regarded as the root of the characteristic Arian description of the Spirit as the one who sanctifies believers. Even Basil was deeply influenced by this restriction of the Spirit's sphere of operation.

Another interpretation of Origen which influenced Basil is that of 1 Cor 12:4-6. Immediately following his declaration in *Jo.* 2.10 that the Spirit is a being distinct from either the Father or the Son,¹¹ Origen writes:¹²

It seems to me that the Holy Spirit provides those who on account of him and of their participation in him are called holy, with the matter (ὕλην) (if I may use the expression) of which the gifts that come from God consist. This matter of God's gifts, as I have called it, is produced by God, is ministered by Christ, and is given concrete existence by the Holy Spirit. I am led to this view by what Paul writes somewhere about God's gifts: 'There are varieties of spiritual gifts, but the same Spirit; there are varieties of ministries, but the same Lord; there are varieties of operations, but it is the same God who produces all in all' [1 Cor 12:4-6].

The gifts of God, mediated by Christ, find concrete expression in the Spirit, who is their substratum (ὕλην). 1 Cor 12:4-6 forms the basis for Origen's assignment of different roles to the members of the Godhead in the creation of these spiritual gifts. Nevertheless, despite the fact that 1 Cor 12:4-6 is understood as a reference to one specific action, in which all of the members of the Godhead co-operate, Origen's main interest in this text lies in the differentiation of the Spirit from the Father and the Son. Yet another instance of the way in which this desire to assert the distinct existence of the Spirit shapes Origen's exegesis is his interpretation of 1 Cor 12:11. In *fr.* 37 in *Jo.* this verse is cited along with Jn 3:8 to show that the Spirit is not merely an activity (οὐσία . . . ἐνεργητική) of God, but is an "active substance" (ἐνέργεια) with his own distinct subsistence.¹³ And in *fr.* 123 in *Jo.* these two texts are cited again to make

¹⁰ Friedo Ricken, "Nikaia als Krisis des altchristlichen Platonismus", *TP*, XLIV (1969), 321-341, *passim*.

¹¹ See pp. 13-14.

¹² P.65.26-35; *PG* 14.129A-B. Trans. Wiles and Santer, *Documents*, pp. 78-79, revised.

¹³ P.513.9-17.

the same point: the Spirit has his own hypostasis, he is not simply an activity of God.¹⁴ 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 6:19 are usually cited or alluded to by Origen to remind his readers that if they are indwelt by the Holy Spirit, then they are the temple of God and as such must be careful not to defile this temple through impurity.¹⁵ However, in light of the way in which Athanasius and Basil employ these texts in their defence of the Spirit's divinity, one particular instance where Origen alludes to 1 Cor 6:19 is especially worthy of note. In *hom. 1 in Gen.* 17, Origen concludes a discussion of Gen 1:29-30, a description of the provisions made by God for man's nourishment in paradise, with an exhortation to feed on that nourishment which, in the words of Origen:¹⁶

...[will] make us worthy to receive in the lodging of our heart the Word and Son of God, who comes with his Father and wishes to make in us his dwelling [cf. Jn 14:23], in the Holy Spirit, whose temple [cf. 1 Cor 6:19] we must first be through holiness.

This allusion to 1 Cor 6:19 in connection with an exhortation to holiness is, as has been said, typical of Origen's use of this text. What is novel is the linking of Jn 14:23 and the Corinthian text, with the implication that the one who is a temple of the Holy Spirit will be indwelt by the two other members of the Godhead. Neither Athanasius nor Basil ever connects Jn 14:23 to 1 Cor 6:19 or 1 Cor 3:16-17; however, the implications of Origen's statement here would not have escaped them.

Finally, due to Athanasius' distinctive use of 2 Cor 2:15,¹⁷ one instance of Origen's interpretation of this verse needs to be noted. The text is a favourite one of Origen and is used by him in a variety of contexts.¹⁸ In one passage from his first homily on Ct, where Origen is explaining the meaning of Ct 1:2-3 (LXX), he states:¹⁹

Christ the Bridegroom, therefore, whom the Father has sent, comes anointed to the Bride and it is said to him: 'You have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows' [Ps 45:7]. If the Bridegroom has touched me, I too become of a good odour, I too am anointed with perfumes; and his perfumes are so imparted to me that I can say with the Apostles, 'We are the good odour of Christ in every place' [2 Cor 2:15].

¹⁴ P.569.2-12.

¹⁵ Cf. *Cels.* 8.19 (p.214.1-9; PG 11.1545C-D); *hom.5 in Jos.* 6 (PG 12.851B-C).

¹⁶ P. 22.8-11; PG 12.160D-161A.

¹⁷ See pp. 88-90.

¹⁸ See, e.g., *hom. 11 in Gen. 1* (p.102.7-14; PG 12.221D-222A); *hom. 2 in Cant.* 2 (p. 44.3-17; PG 13.48B-C); *dial.* 18-19 (pp.92. 13-94.2).

¹⁹ *Hom. 1 in Cant.* 2 (p.30.9-14; PG 13.39B-C). Trans. R.P. Lawson, *Origen: The Song of Songs. Commentary and Homilies* (Ancient Christian Writers, vol. 26; Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press/ London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957), p. 269, revised.

The significance of this passage for the present study lies in the use of 2 Cor 2:15 in a context which concerns the believer's participation in Christ. The one who participates in Christ, the anointed one (Ps 45:7), takes on his fragrance and thus can say with the Apostles, "We are the good odour of Christ". Athanasius will use the Corinthian text in exactly the same way, but with one slight, though important, difference: it is the one who is anointed with the Spirit, the fragrance of Christ, who is enabled to participate in Christ and echo Paul's words in 2 Cor 2:15.

Despite Origen's concern to affirm the distinct subsistence of the Spirit, his pneumatology remained largely functional in orientation and, in the words of Alasdair Heron, "a secondary or even tertiary subcentre" of his theological reflection.²⁰ But this lack of interest in the ontological question about the Spirit's nature and status is not peculiar to Origen; it characterizes most of Greek theological thought for the next century or so after his death *ca.* 254. In fact, the best witness to this state of affairs is the Nicene creed; for its terse statement with regard to the Holy Spirit says everything and nothing.²¹ Cyril of Jerusalem can still declare *ca.* 349 that it is enough to know that the Father bestows all of the gifts of salvation through the Son with the Holy Spirit (σὺν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι), but that it is not fitting to inquire too closely into the Spirit's nature and substance.²² A decade later, Athanasius was compelled to take up the very inquiry which Cyril had discouraged, because of the assertions made by a group of Egyptian Christians at Thmuis that the Holy Spirit is a creature. Athanasius did not claim to have an exhaustive knowledge of the mystery of the Godhead. In fact, 1 Cor 2:10, along with Rom 11:33-34, was adduced by him to show that the nature of the Godhead is ultimately incomprehensible. Nonetheless, the Alexandrian bishop did not feel that he could sit idly by and watch this pneumatological error capture the hearts and minds of his flock.

It should be stressed that his response, in the form of three letters to Serapion of Thmuis, is based on a fresh inquiry of the Scriptural witness about the Spirit. Nearly all of the texts which he employs from the Corinthian correspondence are absent from his earlier writings.²³ It seems that Athanasius, like most of his contemporaries, had spent little time in theological reflection about the nature of the Spirit. His own theological focus was primarily a christological one. For example, his

²⁰ "Holy Spirit", p. 308.

²¹ Pelikan, *Catholic Tradition*, p. 218.

²² *Catech.* 16.24 (PG 33.953A).

²³ See p. 67, n. 58.

account of the life of Antony, that tract which was to become so influential in the ascetic movement, says next to nothing about the Spirit; the driving force in the life of the ascetic is Christ.²⁴

This strong christological perspective also characterizes Athanasius' description of the Spirit in the letters to Serapion. For instance, Athanasius, interpreting 1 Cor 12:13 in connection with 1 Cor 10:4, concludes that the one who drinks of the Spirit also drinks of the Son. This experience is taken by Athanasius to be a reflection of the coinherence of the Spirit and the Son. Athanasius does not explicitly relate the Spirit to the Father, but takes it for granted that his readers will take this step. If the Spirit and the Son coinhere, then the same must be true of the Spirit and the Father, for the Son and the Father coinhere. In Athanasius' second letter to Serapion, 1 Cor 12:13 is interpreted somewhat differently but still in a manner which reveals Athanasius' christological orientation. According to Athanasius, the Spirit has the same relationship to the Son as the Son has to the Father. This principle entails that the Spirit share all of the characteristics of the Son, apart from his name and the Son's mode of existence. Therefore, since the Son is one as the Father is one, the Spirit must also be one. 1 Cor 12:13 and 12:11, both of which describe the Spirit as one, are offered as definitive proof of the Spirit's oneness, and thus of his unity with the Son, and, by inference, of his unity with the Father. This tendency to relate the Spirit to the Son rather than to the Father is also linked to Athanasius' reluctance to call the Spirit "God" or "Creator". The Alexandrian bishop, a traditionalist at heart, is aware that he is breaking new ground and he does not wish to move too fast or too soon.

Another motif which characterizes Athanasius' pneumatological exegesis of 1 and 2 Cor is what has been termed above as the "trinitarian" motif: the Trinity is an indivisible unity.²⁵ One of Athanasius' central affirmations in his discussion with the Arians was that the being of the Father and the Son is identical. In the letters to Serapion, Athanasius takes this affirmation one step further and maintains that the Spirit is also one in being with the Father. Athanasius is, of course, aware that the distinctions between the Father, Son, and Spirit are real, but his major pneumatological concern is the demonstration that the Spirit is one in being with the Father and the Son. This concern is most apparent in his

²⁴ Dorothea Wendebourg, *Geist oder Energie. Zur Frage der inner-göttlichen Verankerung des christlichen Lebens in der byzantinischen Theologie* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1980), pp. 177-179.

²⁵ See p. 100.

exegesis of 1 Cor 2:11-12 and 1 Cor 12:4-6. Athanasius' interpretation of the former text is closely linked to his understanding of 1 Cor 2:10. This text, together with Rom 11:33-34, bears witness to the fact that the depths of God are inaccessible to all created beings. Thus, the fact that the Spirit searches the depths of God shows that he cannot be a creature. Up to this point, Athanasius is simply reproducing Origen's interpretation of the same verse in *princ.* 4.4.8. Origen's qualification of this interpretation in his treatise on prayer is conveniently ignored. Athanasius' originality lies in looking beyond 1 Cor 2:10 to 1 Cor 2:11-12 to see what these verses have to say about the reason why the Spirit is able to search the depths of God and about his relationship to the Father and the Son. Ten years previously Cyril of Jerusalem had also seen in these verses a marked differentiation between the Spirit and the created realm.

No created being is equal in honour to him [the Spirit]. Not all the classes of angels, not all their hosts together have equality with the Holy Spirit. The all-perfect power of the Paraclete overshadows them all. While they are sent to minister, he searches even the depths of God, according to the Apostle: 'For the Spirit searches all things, even the depths of God. For who among men knows the thoughts of a man except the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so, the thoughts of God no one knows except the Spirit of God' [1 Cor 2:10-12].²⁶

But Cyril's reluctance to discuss the further questions about the Spirit's nature prevented him from taking the step Athanasius took.

According to Athanasius, the Spirit is able to search the depths of God because he is "in" (ἐν) God. This interiority of the Spirit means not only that the Spirit partakes of all the characteristics of God, for instance his unchangeability, but also that he is one in being with God the Father. Here, Athanasius is drawing upon the position he had hammered out in his argument with the Arians. When one speaks of the Son being "in the Father", the preposition "in" designates an ontological relationship. Although Basil also states in *Spir.* 16.40 that 1 Cor 2:11 is incontrovertible proof that the Spirit has an inseparable relationship with the Father and the Son, the verse plays relatively little role in the formation of Basil's argument in *Spir.* for the divinity of the Spirit. It would appear that Basil had become aware that this verse, when applied to the Spirit, could be misconstrued as an assertion of Sabellianism. But what prompted this realization? There are a number of specific events, all occurring in the period immediately prior to the writing of *Spir.*, which heightened

²⁶ *Catech.* 16.23 (PG 33.952A). Trans. L.P. McCauley and A.A. Stephenson, *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*, vol. 2 (The Fathers of the Church, vol. 64; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1970), p. 90, revised.

Basil's fear of Sabellianism and served to curtail his use of 1 Cor 2.11. During the early seventies, Basil was embroiled in a fierce struggle with Atarbius of Neocaesarea and his followers, whom he accused of propagating beliefs similar to Sabellius.²⁷ According to Basil, Atarbius affirmed that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one entity which varies in appearance (έν πρᾶγμα πολυπρόσωπον) and one hypostasis.²⁸ At the same time Basil was concerned to stem the influence of Marcellus of Ancyra in Asia Minor. Basil never explicitly calls Marcellus a Sabellian; but in *ep.* 207.1, part of his reply to Atarbius, Basil aligns Atarbius' beliefs with those of both Sabellius and Marcellus.²⁹ Basil evidently saw a dangerous similarity between the teachings of Sabellius and those of Marcellus. It is not surprising, therefore, that when Basil rejects Marcellus' pneumatology because "it did not concede that the Paraclete has his own hypostasis",³⁰ the charge is very similar to the one that he had levelled against the pneumatology of Sabellius. Moreover, as Joseph T. Lienhard has recently pointed out, the anti-Sabellian polemic of Basil's *hom.* 24 should certainly be regarded as directed against the teachings of Marcellus.³¹ It is noteworthy that in this homily Basil rejects the view that the Father and the Son are united as one person (πρόσωπον) even as a man is one, inseparably united with his reason and wisdom (οὐ διαιρούμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνυπάρχοντος αὐτῷ λόγου καὶ τῆς σοφίας).³² This Marcellan assertion appears to be based on 1 Cor 2:11. The dangers posed by the analogy in this Scriptural text must have become very apparent to the Cappadocian bishop.

Intensifying Basil's fear of Sabellianism was the fact that after his break with Eustathius, the latter circulated a slanderous report that Basil was in communion with one suspected of heresy, namely Apollinaris of Laodicea. In an open letter from Eustathius to a certain Dazizas, written in the winter of 374-375, Eustathius charged that Basil's trinitarian theology, especially his pneumatology, was infected with Sabellianism as a result of this friendship with Apollinaris. This accusation was substantiated by the citation of certain passages, whose author was not named, but which, taken by themselves, might well be understood in a Sabellian sense. The inclusion of these anonymous statements within a

²⁷ *Ep.* 207.1 (II, 184.15-18; *PG* 32.760C).

²⁸ *Ep.* 210.3 (II, 192.15-21; *PG* 32.772B-C).

²⁹ II, 184.15-18; *PG* 32.760C).

³⁰ *Ep.* 263.5 (III, 125.8-9; *PG* 32.981A).

³¹ "Ps-Athanasius, Contra Sabellianos, and Basil of Caesarea, Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos: Analysis and Comparison", *VChr*, 40 (1986), 365-389, *passim*.

³² *Hom.* 24.1 (*PG* 31.601A)

document written against Basil would have convinced people that he was their author or, at least, was in full agreement with them. In fact, so effective was this smear campaign against Basil that many in Asia Minor regarded his name with abhorrence.³³ Thus, by the time that he came to write *Spir.*, Basil heartily wished to avoid any statement that smacked of Sabellianism.

Athanasius' consideration of the following verse, 1 Cor 2:12, is focused upon the use of the preposition "from" (ἐκ) in the verse. The Alexandrian bishop regards the use of this preposition as proof that the Spirit has an uncreated nature, since he comes from God, who is uncreated being (ὁ ὢν). Once again, Athanasius is utilizing an argument which he had developed during his debate with the Arians. Central to this debate was the way in which the phrase "from God" (ἐκ θεοῦ) was to be interpreted.³⁴ The Arians had insisted that when this phrase was used to describe the Son, it meant that the Son had been created "by the will of God".³⁵ Against this interpretation, Athanasius had argued that the Son is "from God" in the sense that he is the "offspring of the paternal being" (τῆς πατρικῆς οὐσίας)³⁶ and as such completely different from those beings which have come into being through the will of God. Thus, when Athanasius comes to interpret 1 Cor 2:12 in the debate with the Tropici, his understanding of the statement that the Spirit is "from God" (ἐκ θεοῦ) is determined by his christological interpretation of the phrase "from God". In order to prevent the Tropici from misunderstanding this phrase with regard to the Spirit in the same way as the Arians had misunderstood it with regard to the Son, Athanasius elaborates it with the statement:³⁷

God is being (ὢν ἔστιν) and the Spirit is from him (ἐξ οὗ).

This statement functions as a rough parallel to Athanasius' assertion that the Son is "from the being (ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας)" of God. Both of these assertions serve to highlight the difference between the Spirit and the Son, on the one hand, and the creatures, on the other, who came into being from nothing.

Although Athanasius, unlike Basil, did not connect 1 Cor 2:12 to the question about the Spirit's mode of existence, a question which he

³³ See p. 42.

³⁴ See Stead, *Divine Substance*, pp. 223-242, *passim*.

³⁵ Stead, *Divine Substance*, pp. 225-226, 227-228; Gregg and Groh, *Early Arianism*, pp. 5-6, 84-87, 98-99.

³⁶ *Ar.* 3.6 (PG 26.333A). See the comments of Gregg and Groh, *Early Arianism*, pp. 85-86.

³⁷ *Ep. Serap.* 1.22 (PG 26.581B).

basically left unanswered, his exposition of this Corinthian text made a significant impact upon the subsequent use of the text. For instance, the credal statement of the Council of Constantinople affirms that the Spirit “proceeds from (ἐκ) the Father”. This formulation goes back to Jn 15:26, but the use of the preposition “from within” (ἐκ) instead of the Johannine “from” (παρά) probably reflects the influence of 1 Co 2:12. This statement, as De Halleux has argued,³⁸ was probably not intended to be a description of the Spirit’s mode of existence. Rather, it represents a return to the position of Athanasius: the Spirit is divine because he is from God. According to this statement, the Father is the unique origin and source not only of the deity of the Son, but also of that of the Spirit. The anti-Pneumatomachian thrust of this statement is readily apparent once it is realized that the Pneumatomachi refused to recognize the Spirit’s derivation from the Father, claiming that it infringed on the honour of the Only-Begotten.³⁹ Even after the Council of Constantinople, Athanasius’ interpretation of 1 Cor 2:12 continued to play an important role in the orthodox rebuttal of the Pneumatomachian position. In the report of Theodore of Mopsuestia’s debate with some Pneumatomachian bishops at Anazarbus, the metropolis of *Cilicia secunda*, in 392,⁴⁰ Theodore stressed that the emphasis of 1 Cor 2:12 on the fact that the Spirit which believers have received is from God and not from the world obviously distinguishes the Spirit from all other spirits. They are from the world, that is, the realm which has received its existence from God. But he is from God by nature and eternal.⁴¹ Like Athanasius, Theodore refused to discuss the mode of the Spirit’s existence; it is sufficient to realize that “he is from God, not as a creature, but in a unique manner”.⁴²

For Athanasius, as for Basil, 1 Cor 12:4-6 is proof of the monarchy of God the Father and of the fact that in every divine activity the Spirit is present, actualizing the activities initiated by the Father. Yet, Athanasius, viewing this text as a witness to the Spirit’s actualization of the common activity of the Trinity, regards it primarily as a testimony about the common being of the Father, Son, and Spirit. Athanasius’ argument in his discussion of this text proceeds from the unity of the persons of the

³⁸ “Profession”, pp. 32-37. Cf. also the statement of Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 125.

³⁹ Ritter, *Konzil*, pp. 299-301; Kelly, *Creeds*, p. 344. See also Kretschmar, *Studien*, pp. 12-13.

⁴⁰ *Maced.* (PO 9.637-667).

⁴¹ *Maced.* 9-10 (PO 9.644-648). Cf. *Maced.* 21-24 (PO 9.660-664).

⁴² *Maced.* 21 (PO 9.661). For a good study of Theodore’s pneumatology, see J.M. Dewart, *The Theology of Grace of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, no. 16; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1971), pp. 132-151. See also Swete, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 256-262.

Godhead in every divine operation to the underlying unity of being of these persons. In other words, Athanasius views the relationships which hold between the members of the Godhead in their activity in creation as a reflection of the relationships which hold between those members within the Godhead itself. Athanasius thus retains the Biblical insistence that discussion about God be in terms of his revelation of himself in creation and history. However, the nature of the Pneumatomachian assertions about the Spirit forced Athanasius to go beyond this functional approach to discussing God and compelled him to draw ontological conclusions from what the Scriptures said about the activity of God and his Spirit.

At first sight, Origen's exegesis of 1 Cor 12:4-6 in *Jo.* 2.10 appears to be very similar to that of Athanasius in his letters to Serapion. Origen also stresses that this passage refers to one specific divine action, in which all the members of the Godhead co-operate. Nevertheless, his motive for citing the text in *Jo.* 2.10 is quite different from that of Athanasius in the letters to Serapion. For Origen regards the text as proof of the Spirit's distinct subsistence, whereas Athanasius views it as a witness to the Spirit's oneness in being with the Father and the Son. Not only different concerns, but also different theological traditions have caused this change in interpretation. Athanasius' approach to the Godhead has little in common with that of Origen, whose focus was on the differentiation of the members of the Godhead. Athanasius, on the other hand, has a deep interest in the affirmation of the indivisible unity of the Godhead.⁴³ The origins of Athanasius' trinitarian orientation cannot be traced merely to the credal statement issued at Nicaea in 325; for in *gent.* and *inc.*, written *ca.* 318,⁴⁴ there is no trace of the subordinationism typical of Origen's theology and those theologies influenced by him.⁴⁵ It is more than likely that Athanasius acquired his theological perspective from his predecessor, Alexander of Alexandria.⁴⁶ For in the midst of the criticism directed against Origen's theological reflection, Alexander placed the Son and the Spirit on the side of the uncreated Father, and not on the side of the creatures.⁴⁷

Nevertheless, Origen's conception of the Spirit's distinctive role as sanctifier, which surfaces in his interpretation of 1 Cor 12:3, did exercise

⁴³ See pp. 94-97.

⁴⁴ For the dating, see Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism'", pp. 174-175.

⁴⁵ Rist, "Basil's 'Neoplatonism'", pp. 175-176.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 175-176.

⁴⁷ Barmann, "Cappadocian Triumph", p. 201.

a great influence on Athanasius' exposition of a number of texts from the Corinthian correspondence. For instance, according to Athanasius' reading of 1 Cor 6:11, the Spirit sanctifies the creatures. Since this activity is one that only God can perform, the Spirit must be regarded as divine. Again, Athanasius argues that since 1 Cor 3:16 depicts believers as a "temple of God" which is indwelt by the Spirit of God, then the Spirit must enable believers to partake of the Father and to be indwelt by the entire Trinity. This activity of the Spirit, which is nothing less than deification, implies that the Spirit is divine since he performs an action which only God can perform. Thus, Athanasius' exegesis of these passages begins with Origen's understanding of the Spirit as the source of sanctification and then, by means of an argument which had been prominent in Athanasius' case for the deity of the Son, draws out the deeper implications of this understanding. If the creatures are the objects of the Spirit's sanctifying activity, then he cannot belong to the same realm as they but must be divine.⁴⁸

This soteriological argument recurs in connection with Athanasius' interpretation of 2 Cor 2:15. On the basis of this verse, believers can declare that they are "the fragrance of Christ". This declaration is possible, Athanasius argues, only because the Spirit, who has the "fragrance" of Christ, imparts this "fragrance" to believers, enabling them to become partakers of Christ. For the Spirit to effect such a participation he must be one in being with Christ and divine like Christ. Now, 2 Cor 2:15 occurs only in one other place in the Athanasian corpus, and in a context which fails to illuminate its use here in the letters to Serapion.⁴⁹ It was, however, a favourite text of Origen, and Athanasius, who was well acquainted with the work of the Alexandrian theologian, would certainly have been aware of the ways in which Origen interprets the Corinthian text. It may even be the case that Athanasius was familiar with Origen's use of 2 Cor 2:15 in *hom. 1 in Cant. 2* to describe the believer's participation in Christ.⁵⁰ Be that as it may, Athanasius' exegesis of this Corinthian verse illustrates the way trinitarian thought moved from Origen into the latter half of the fourth century. Origen could afford to ignore the Spirit's role in the believer's participation in Christ. But once the question of the Spirit's nature had been raised, it was

⁴⁸ See Pelikan, *Catholic Tradition*, pp. 215-216.

⁴⁹ See p. 89, n. 178.

⁵⁰ Cf. Shapland, *Letters*, p. 40. There Shapland discusses the influence on Athanasius of Origen's exegesis of Ps 45:7 in *princ. 2.6.6* (pp.320.201-322.218; *PG 11.214B-C*), a passage which is very similar to *hom. 1 in Cant. 2*.

inevitable that the discussion of this question involve a consideration of whether the Spirit participates in the Godhead as do the creatures or whether he enables the creatures to participate in God. If he enables the creatures to participate in the Son and the Father, as Athanasius endeavours to show by 2 Cor 2:15, then he must belong essentially to the Godhead, for only one that is divine can enable another to share in the qualities inherent in the divine being.

This soteriological argument was, as Pelikan notes,⁵¹ an important one in the development of an orthodox pneumatology. It is thus no surprise to find Basil employing it frequently in his defence of the Spirit's divinity. In this defence, Basil made Origen's emphasis on the Spirit as the locus of sanctification one of the major starting-points for his own doctrine of the Spirit. Here, his monastic spirituality, centred as it was on the Holy Spirit, seems to have been a decisive factor in his acceptance of Origen's emphasis as a basis for his own pneumatology. Basil even went so far as to state that the distinctive characteristic of the Spirit is "sanctification", whereas those of the Father and the Son are "fatherhood" and "sonship" respectively.⁵² G.W.H. Lampe⁵³ regards this statement as an attempt to provide an inter-trinitarian differentiation between the members of the Godhead. Viewed from this perspective, it is obviously unsatisfactory, for "fatherhood" and "sonship" are modes of existence, whereas "sanctification" is an activity. However, as Verhees rightly points out,⁵⁴ this statement occurs in a private letter which was written in response to specific queries that Amphilochius had made after his reading of *Spir.*, and apart from a similar remark in *ep.* 214.4,⁵⁵ it is unique in the Basilian corpus. Consequently, Verhees argues that Basil is not principally concerned with presenting the inter-trinitarian differences of the members of the Godhead in comprehensible categories of thought. Basil's primary concern is the simple confession of the distinct subsistences of Father, Son, and Spirit on the basis of their saving and historical activity.⁵⁶ Thus, Basil's designation of the Spirit's distinctive characteristic as "sanctification" is not at all a blunder. Rather, this designation, drawn from Origen's view of the Spirit as the locus and power of sanctification, is employed to express Basil's belief that it is

⁵¹ *Catholic Tradition*, pp. 215-216.

⁵² *Ep.* 236.6 (III, 53.7-9; *PG* 32.884A-B).

⁵³ "Christian Theology", p. 114.

⁵⁴ "Mitteilbarkeit", p. 22.

⁵⁵ II, 205,1-206.22; *PG* 32.789A-B.

⁵⁶ "Mitteilbarkeit", pp. 22-23.

only through the Holy Spirit that God's saving work is accomplished and also to fulfill a desire to avoid speculation about the Spirit's mode of existence within the Godhead.

Now, this view of the Spirit's activity is definitive for Basil's interpretation of 1 Cor 3:16. From Basil's point of view, this text indicates that the saint is the "proper place for the Spirit". In other words, the saint is that locale where the Spirit is particularly active, transforming the believer into a temple fit for the contemplation and worship of God. Basil concludes by using an argument which, as noted above, was a standard one in the earlier debates over the divinity of the Son and which Athanasius had adapted to the controversy over the Spirit's divinity: if the Spirit transforms the believer in such a way, then he must be divine, since he does what only God can do.

However, this emphasis on sanctification as the Spirit's distinctive characteristic was not without its dangers. The Pneumatomachi whom Gregory of Nyssa encountered in Sebaste during his sojourn there in 380 were prepared to admit that sanctification was an activity distinctive of the Spirit.⁵⁷ But behind this admission lay a desire to exclude the Spirit from other areas of divine activity, for instance creation, and so deny that the Spirit was equal in power and status with the Father and the Son. Such a conclusion would not have been acceptable to Basil, who could not only argue that the Spirit had an essential role to fulfill in the creative activity of the Father and the Son,⁵⁸ but also declare in *hom.* 24.5:⁵⁹

Where the Holy Spirit is present, there Christ also dwells; and where Christ is, it is clear that the Father is also present there. 'Do you not know that your bodies are a temple of the Holy Spirit in you?' [1 Cor 6:19]. And, 'if someone destroys the temple of God, him will God destroy' [1 Cor 3:17]. Therefore, when we are sanctified by the Spirit we receive Christ who dwells in our inner man and with Christ [comes] the Father, making those who are worthy their common dwelling.

This text makes it abundantly clear that although Basil placed great emphasis on the fact that Father, Son, and Spirit each has his own hypostasis, he was no tritheist. Though sanctification is the distinctive characteristic of the Spirit, it does not take place apart from the Father and the Son. Basil's interpretation of 1 Cor 6:19 and 3:17 in *hom.* 24.5 not only agrees with Athanasius' emphasis, apropos of 1 Cor 3:16, that

⁵⁷ See p. 188.

⁵⁸ See pp. 121-125.

⁵⁹ *PG* 31.609C-D.

when a believer is indwelt by the Spirit, he is also indwelt by the Father and the Son, but also resembles Origen's exposition of Jn 14:23 and 1 Cor 6:19 in *hom. 1 in Gen.* 17. But, for Basil and Athanasius, the fact that the Spirit enables the believers to be indwelt by the Trinity is a proof of the Spirit's equal status with the Father and Son. Origen, on the other hand, with his view of a hierarchical Godhead would not have drawn such a conclusion.

Thus, Basil's decision to make Origen's view of the Spirit as the locus of divine sanctification one of the foundation-stones for his own pneumatology did not result in tritheism, a tendency inherent in Origen's conception of the Godhead and his view of the Spirit's particular realm of activity. Nor did it lead to an affirmation of a "cult of the Spirit", as his Pneumatomachian opponents suggested.⁶⁰ The bishop of Caesarea was aware that the dynamic activity of the Spirit is inextricably bound up with the saving work of Christ, all of which has its origin in the will of the Father. An excellent summation of this awareness, described above under the term "image theology",⁶¹ is offered by Basil's statement in a letter to some of his monks. He writes:⁶²

We never separate the Paraclete from the union with the Father and Son. For our mind, illuminated by the Spirit, looks up to the Son and in him, as in an image, contemplates the Father.

This perspective, elements of which can be traced back to Origen,⁶³ is decisive for Basil's interpretation of both 1 Cor 12:3 and 1 Cor 12:4-6.

It is surprising that Athanasius makes no use whatsoever of 1 Cor 12:3 in his defence of the Spirit's divinity.⁶⁴ Needless to say, it was an important text for Basil. Basil regards it as an affirmation that it is impossible to know who Christ is or worship him without the aid and presence of the Spirit. The crux of his interpretation rests upon the preposition "in" (ἐν): the Spirit discloses within himself the glory of the Son and in this manner leads the believer into the knowledge of who Jesus is. This revelation of the true reality of Jesus, in turn, enables the believer to ascend to the vision of the Father. The Spirit is thus inseparable from the Son and the Father. Moreover, this inseparable relationship and the fact that it is only in the Spirit that Jesus can be worshipped

⁶⁰ See pp. 151-152.

⁶¹ See pp. 119, 127-129, 151-152.

⁶² *Ep.* 226.3 (III, 27.33-36; *PG* 32.849A).

⁶³ See Dehnhard, *Problem*, pp. 44-46.

⁶⁴ *Pace* Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1976), p. 408.

mean that the Spirit must be glorified together with the Son and the Father. Origen's use of 1 Cor 12:3 to draw distinctions between the different spheres of divine action, which, in turn, reflects the different gradations of being within the Godhead, has been firmly rejected. It should be stressed, however, that the conclusion which Origen drew from this text, namely, that the Spirit's sphere of activity is restricted to the realm of the saints, was, as noted above, an important factor in the formation of Basil's pneumatology.

Basil's exposition of 1 Cor 12:3 was taken up and developed in a significant manner by his brother.⁶⁵ One particular instance of this development is worthy of note. Towards the end of his treatise *Maced.* Nyssen argues that it is unnatural for the one who is engaged in worshipping the Father not to think also of the one of whom he is the Father. But then he could not think of the Son unless he had first been illuminated by the Spirit, "for no one can say Jesus is Lord, except in the Holy Spirit".⁶⁶ Thus, for the Cappadocian tradition represented by Basil and Gregory, 1 Cor 12:3 was an important text for both the conglorification and coadoration of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son. The significance of this interpretation of 1 Cor 12:3 is revealed when it is recalled that the thought of both Basil and Gregory played an influential role in the drafting of the pneumatological article of C, which concluded with the affirmation that the Spirit was due the same worship and glory as the Father and the Son.

Athanasius regarded 1 Cor 12:4-6 as proof that the Father, the Son, and the Spirit share a common being. Basil is not adverse to this interpretation, as *Eun.* 3.4 shows.⁶⁷ However, Basil also regards this passage as a clear affirmation of the hypostatic differentiation of the Godhead. It is noteworthy that Origen also understood this passage as an assertion about the distinct subsistence of each of the members of the Godhead. Origen seems to have regarded the different roles which the members of the Godhead play in the creation of the spiritual gifts as a concrete indication that each member of the Godhead is a distinct entity. Basil takes over this insight of Origen, but employs it for his own purposes. 1 Cor 12:4-6 is first understood by Basil to be a description of the way in which the purified soul comes to know God: in the Spirit the purified soul is able to contemplate the Son, and the one of whom the Son

⁶⁵ See Daniélou, "Chrismation", pp. 192-198; May, "Verhältnis", pp. 512-513; Parmentier, "Doctrine" (1976), pp. 407-414.

⁶⁶ *Maced.* (pp. 113.24-114.5).

⁶⁷ See pp. 149-150.

is the image, the Father. Basil then proceeds to maintain that this way to the knowledge of God is actually a converse reflection of the way the divine characteristics extend from the Father through the Son to the Spirit. Thus, Basil concludes, “the hypostases are confessed and the pious dogma of the monarchy is not lost”.⁶⁸

The difference between this amplification of Origen’s interpretation and that of Athanasius is rooted in the fact that Basil’s trinitarian theology, though not tritheistic, took its starting-point from the three hypostases, whereas that of Athanasius began with their one divine being. In fact, Basil’s point of departure in working out a trinitarian theology, together with his monastic spirituality, enabled him to develop in a more positive manner than Athanasius the Spirit’s place in such a theology. *Spir.* 9 is an excellent example of this fact. This difference between Basil and Athanasius is reflected also in their interpretation of 1 Cor 12:11 and 2 Cor 3:17-18.

For Athanasius, 1 Cor 12:11 is a relatively insignificant text. It is cited by the bishop of Alexandria for the sole reason that it employs the adjective “one” in regard to the Spirit. Oneness, which Athanasius considers to be a characteristic of only the Father and the Son, is thus applicable to the Spirit and so differentiates him from the creatures, who are many. Yet, for Basil, this text is an important witness to the Spirit’s lordship, and thus, to his divinity. From Gregory Thaumaturgus, Basil had inherited the view that between God and the created realm there exists a fundamental ontological divide, which was expressed by the contrasting terms “Master”/“Lord” and “servant”. When 1 Cor 12:11 states that the Spirit bestows the spiritual gifts “as he wills”, Basil interprets this to mean that the Spirit exercises his authority in a manner befitting one who is totally free, that is, one who is Lord. Basil has not rejected Origen’s view of this verse as a statement about the Spirit’s distinct subsistence, but has developed it in the light of his own view of the Spirit’s place in the Trinity. In fact, Origen, in *fr. 116 in Lam.*,⁶⁹ can state that the Spirit’s distribution of the spiritual gifts “as he wills” implies that the Spirit acts in the manner befitting a sovereign, not a slave (ἀυθεντικῶς οὐ δουλικῶς)! When it is recalled that Basil’s treatment of this text in *Eun.* 3.4 and *hom.* 15.3 is nearly identical to this statement,⁷⁰ there is no doubt that Origen’s remark has been used by Basil as part of the basis of his exposition of 1 Cor 12:11.

⁶⁸ *Spir.* 18.47 (p. 95.21-22; *PG* 32.153C).

⁶⁹ *PG* 13.660B.

⁷⁰ See pp. 149-150.

Basil's brother, Nyssen, also frequently employs this text. Two instances are especially illuminating in view of the fact that Nyssen's pneumatology can be viewed as a synthesis of the Athanasian and Basilian traditions. In the first text,⁷¹ which occurs in a letter that has been wrongly attributed to Basil in the past, Nyssen employs 1 Cor 12:11 in order to demonstrate that the hypostases of the Godhead have some characteristics which they do not hold in common. This position reflects a typically Basilian emphasis. According to Nyssen's interpretation of 1 Cor 12:11 the Spirit is the one from whom "the entire supply of good things flows forth upon creation".⁷² Yet, deeper investigation reveals that this supply does not stem from the Spirit alone, but that the only begotten God is its author and origin (αἵτιον). In turn, the one who conceives of the Son in this manner is led to see that even he is not the ultimate origin (αἵτια) of this supply, for that privilege belongs solely to the Father, the source of all that exists.⁷³ From this consideration of the implications of 1 Cor 12:11, Gregory concludes that it is characteristic of the Spirit to derive his existence from the Father, and to be known both after and together with the Son: after the Son, because it is the distinctive property of the Son to make known the Spirit, and together with the Son, since it is impossible to conceive of the Son unless one has been enlightened by the Holy Spirit.⁷⁴ A further characteristic peculiar to the Son is his shining forth from the Father as the Only-Begotten from the unbegotten light. The Father is distinguished by his fatherhood and underived existence.⁷⁵ In the second text, from the treatise *tres dii*, Nyssen changes tack and argues from 1 Cor 12:11 that the united activity of the members of the Godhead is an indication of their common nature. This position reflects a typically Athanasian emphasis.⁷⁶ These different, though complementary, interpretations of 1 Cor 12:11 well reveal Nyssen's attempt to synthesize the pneumatological traditions which he had inherited from Basil and Athanasius.

Basil provides two interpretations of 2 Cor 3:17-18 in his *magnum*

⁷¹ *Ep.* 38 (I, 81-92; *PG* 32.325A-340C). On Gregory's authorship of this letter, see Reinhard Hübner, "Gregor von Nyssa, als Verfasser der sog. *Ep.* 38 des Basilios. Zum unterschiedlichen Verständnis der οὐσία bei den kappadozischen Brüdern" in Fontaine and Kannengiesser, eds., *EPEKTASIS*, pp. 463-490.

⁷² *Ep.* 38.4 (I, 84.2-8, 85.23-24; *PG* 32.329A-B,C).

⁷³ *Ep.* 38.4 (I, 84.6-21; *PG* 32.329B-C).

⁷⁴ *Ep.* 38.4 (I, 84.22-85.29; *PG* 32.329C). See also the comments of Torrance, "Spiritus Creator", pp. 223-224.

⁷⁵ *Ep.* 38.4 (I, 85.29-38; *PG* 32.329C-332A).

⁷⁶ *Tres dii* (pp.50.13-51.15; *PG* 45.128C-129A). See the comments of Hübner ("Verfasser", p. 488) on these two passages.

opus on the Holy Spirit. The first is based upon the view which he had inherited from Gregory Thaumaturgus, namely that there is an absolute ontological divide between God and his creation which can be expressed by the terms “Master”/“Lord” and “servant”. When the Scriptures call the Spirit “Lord”, as Basil believes they do in 2 Cor 3:17-18, then they at once indicate that the Spirit belongs to God. It is somewhat surprising that Athanasius makes no use of this verse in his letters to Serapion. There are two explanations for this fact. In the first place, Athanasius was part of a long tradition which held that the “Lord” mentioned in this text was Christ. It should be recalled that even Basil, in an early treatment of this text in *Eun.* 3.3, had adhered to this viewpoint.⁷⁷ Second, the contrast “Master”/“Lord”—“servant” was not important for Athanasius; thus, he did not scour the Scriptures for an explicit mention of the Spirit’s lordship. What was important for him was the contrast “Creator”—“creature”. Thus, a number of texts from the Corinthian correspondence (namely 1 Cor 2:11-12, 3:16-17, 6:11, 12:11,13 and 2 Cor 2:15) were adduced to show that the Spirit exercised creative powers equal to those of the Father and the Son. But how is Basil’s novel interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17-18 in *Spir.* to be explained? Probably the best answer lies in Basil’s readiness to adapt his theological argument to the circumstances in which he finds himself. This adaptability does not imply that there was a capricious streak in Basil; rather, it indicates his ability to make his audience and circumstances the starting-point for his theological reflections. In this particular case, Basil’s interpretation comes as a reply to Eustathius’ statement that the Spirit is “neither slave nor master, but free”.

The second exposition of 2 Cor 3:17-18 which Basil gives in *Spir.* builds upon this interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17-18, as well as utilizing Origen’s exegesis of the same Corinthian text. Origen had used this text on a couple of occasions to argue that once the literal interpretation of the Scriptures was surmounted, the way was open for a contemplation, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, of the deep spiritual truths which lie hidden beneath the Scriptural text.⁷⁸ Basil retains this interpretation, but places the emphasis on the Spirit. Meditation upon the sacred text, Basil argues, brings the reader into contact, not only with deep spiritual truths, but also with the Spirit, who transforms him into a “spiritual person”. From this transformation, and here Basil has recourse to the soteriological argument described above, one can infer only that the Spirit is divine,

⁷⁷ See pp. 153-154.

⁷⁸ See p. 156.

since he does what only God can do. This pneumatological interpretation of 2 Cor 3:17-18 is surely the most significant reason for the inclusion of the predicate "Lord" in the Council of Constantinople's credal description of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁹

This development of a more positive pneumatology had, however, one particular drawback. An explication of the way in which the Spirit differs from the Father and the Son now became a matter which had to be treated. Athanasius, as noted above, had left this question basically unanswered, to the confusion of his Pneumatomachian opponents at Thmuis. However, the insistent queries of Basil's opponents, as well as Basil's desire to avoid tritheism, compelled the bishop of Caesarea to examine this question of the Spirit's particular mode of existence. In *hom.* 24, he employs 1 Cor 2:12 to state that the Spirit proceeds "ineffably from God". But, in *Spir.*, the Corinthian text is the starting-point for a more positive declaration. To the question "how does the Spirit proceed from God?", Basil answers, "as the breath of his mouth". Beyond this analogy he refuses to go. After Basil's death in 379, his friend, Nazianzen, did go further and coined a number of terms, including the term "procession" (ἐκπόρευσις), to describe the Spirit's mode of existence. But it is significant that the credal statement of the Council of Constantinople was content with the affirmation that the Spirit "proceeds from the Father". The lack of a technical description of the Spirit's mode of existence within this creed may have been among the reasons why Nazianzen refused to have anything to do with it.⁸⁰

It may be said in conclusion that it has been demonstrated that the debate over the interpretation of various passages from 1 and 2 Cor with regard to the divinity of the Spirit was not simply one between the orthodox and their Pneumatomachian opponents. The examination of Athanasius' and Basil's interpretation of various texts from these letters provides the evidence that a lively debate about the proper interpretation of some of the passages from these letters also raged within the orthodox camp.

Athanasius' exegesis of the Corinthian correspondence in defence of the Spirit's divinity is clearly based upon a fresh examination of those passages which are relevant to this defence. However, the christological focus of his theology, developed in the debate with the Arians, frequently guides his interpretation of these texts. This focus is particularly

⁷⁹ Laminski, *Der Heilige Geist*, p. 124; De Halleux, "Profession", p. 26.

⁸⁰ See pp. 180-181

evident, for example, in his interpretation of 1 Cor 12:13. But it is also apparent, for instance, in his exegesis of 1 Cor 2:11-12, where the prepositions “in” and “from” are interpreted from the standpoint of the meanings which he had given to these prepositions in his argument for the Son’s divinity.

In Athanasius’ exegesis of other texts, for instance 1 Cor 12:4-6, another perspective, which is vital to Athanasius’ position, is revealed, namely, that the Trinity is indivisibly one and qualitatively different from the created realm. However, this perspective, which was a product of his theological education and which was confirmed by the credal declaration of Nicaea, prevented Athanasius from developing a trinitarian theology which did full justice to the Spirit. The task of developing a more positive pneumatology fell upon the shoulders of Basil, Athanasius’ successor in the struggle against the Pneumatomachi.

Basil’s theological background, in which the hypostases formed the starting-point for trinitarian theology, as well as his monastic spirituality which was centred on the Holy Spirit, provided Basil with the resources for this task. The basis of his trinitarian theology led him to differ from some of Athanasius’ interpretations of 1 and 2 Cor, in particular, that of 1 Cor 2:11 and 12:4-6. Basil seems to have rejected Athanasius’ interpretation of the first text because of its Sabellian overtones. With regard to the latter text, Basil does not disagree with Athanasius’ interpretation, but he is able to amplify it considerably by using the text to discuss the Spirit’s relationship to the Father and the Son within the Godhead. In the discussion about this exposition it was noted that Basil’s interpretation employs Origen’s understanding of the passage as a statement about the Spirit’s distinct subsistence. In fact, a great number of Basil’s interpretations of the various texts from the Corinthian letters which he uses in his defence of the Spirit’s divinity take their start from the prior exposition of these texts by Origen. This dependence upon Origen should not be taken to imply that Basil agreed with the trinitarian theology of the Alexandrian author. He is well aware that Origen’s pneumatological thought is not entirely sound.⁸¹

Basil is a faithful supporter of the trinitarian theology set forth in the Nicene creed, which established once and for all a fundamental ontological gap between God and his creation. Consequently, Basil will not share Origen’s vision of a hierarchical Godhead. But, Origen’s insistence on

⁸¹ *Spir.* 29.73 (pp. 142.4-144.13; *PG* 32.204A-C). See also Gribomont, “Origénisme”, *passim*.

treating the Spirit as a distinct entity in his own right seems to have led the Cappadocian bishop to re-consider Origen's exegesis of such texts as 1 Cor 12:4-6, 12:11 and 2 Cor 3:17-18 and use them as a starting-point for his own interpretation of these texts. On the other hand, Athanasius, who never voices any disapproval of Origen,⁸² restricts his use of the Alexandrian theologian to those areas which relate to the saving and sanctifying activity of the Spirit.

Despite these differences between Athanasius and Basil, there was much which they held in common. For instance, they both share the epistemological premise that since God's nature is known by God alone, any knowledge of God must be provided by God himself. Another concept common to both authors is that there is a fundamental ontological gap between God and the created realm, though they use different contrasts to express it, namely, "Creator" — "creature" (Athanasius) and "Lord" — "servant" (Basil). Moreover, this concept entailed the same soteriological consequences for both authors. If the Spirit is not described as "Creator" (Athanasius)/ "Lord" (Basil), then the saving work of God on behalf of men is nullified. For it is the Spirit who actualizes this work of salvation in the lives of men and women, an activity which only one who is divine can perform.

These similarities enabled Gregory of Nyssa to develop a pneumatology which this writer believes was a synthesis of the thought of both Athanasius and Basil. Nyssen builds upon his brother's pneumatology; but he attempts to correct those areas of his brother's thought which he regards as deficient with concepts drawn from Athanasius' theology of the Spirit. Consequently, his exegesis of the Scriptures, for example 1 Cor 12:11, in the formulation of a doctrine of the Spirit, is sometimes very similar to that of Athanasius. However, further study of Nyssen's pneumatological exegesis of Scripture needs to be done to determine the extent of its similarities and differences with regard to that of Basil, on the one hand, and to that of Athanasius, on the other.

Finally, both Athanasius and Basil firmly believed that the Scriptures had to be the basis of a sound pneumatology. This conviction, as well as the Pneumatomachian insistence that the orthodox pneumatological views be demonstrated primarily by Scriptural evidence, meant that Scriptural exegesis was central to the pneumatological discussions of the latter half of the fourth century. This book has provided a detailed analysis of Athanasius' and Basil's exegesis of a number of texts from

⁸² Meijering, "Athanasius", pp. 100-101.

1 and 2 Cor which were central to their defence of the Spirit's divinity. It has clearly shown the way in which their theological concerns determined the questions which these authors put to these texts and shaped the answers which they received.

Their exegesis may not satisfy the modern exegete, but it is to be hoped that he or she will realize that in every age the Church's study of the Scriptures has been informed by its theological position. Moreover, there is still much that is of great value in the intense reflection of Athanasius, Basil, and their contemporaries on the Scriptural record about the Holy Spirit and his activity in the world. For they were not ivory-tower academicians, but active leaders in the Church of their day, men who sought to be faithful witnesses to the Spirit, whom they recognized as the one who imparts God's life and holiness.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources: Texts and Translations

A. ORIGEN

- Benz, Ernst and Erich Klostermann, eds. *Origenes Matthäuseklärung. Vol. I: Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*. Vol. 10 of *Origenes Werke*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 40. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1935.
- Borret, Marcel, ed. and trans. *Origène: Contre Celse*. Vols. 3 and 4. Sources Chrétiennes, nos. 147 and 150. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969.
- Butterworth, G.W., trans. *Origen: On First Principles*. New York: Harper & Row, Publ., 1966.
- Chadwick, Henry, trans. *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953.
- Crouzel, Henri and Manlio Simonetti, eds. and trans. *Origène: Traité des Principes*. 4 vols. Sources Chrétiennes, nos. 252-253, 268-269. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978, 1980.
- Greer, R.A., trans. *Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, First Principles: Book IV, Prologue to the Commentary on the Song of Songs, Homily XXVII on Numbers*. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Preuschen, Erwin, ed. *Der Johanneskommentar*. Vol. 4 of *Origenes Werke*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, [vol. 10]. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1903.
- Rue, C. and C. Vincent de la, eds., and trans. *Origenis opera omnia*. Vols. 11-17 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1857-1863.
- Wiles, Maurice and Mark Santer, trans. *Documents in Early Christian Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975. [Contains a translation of Origen's *Jo.* 2.10-12].

B. ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

- Burgess, Henry, trans. *The Festal Epistles of S. Athanasius*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854.
- Egan, G.A., ed. and trans. *The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop Serapion Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Studies and Documents, vol. 37. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.
- Gregg, R.C., trans. *Athanasius: The Life of Antony and The Letter to Marcellinus*. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: The Paulist Press, 1980.
- Lebon, Joseph, trans. *Athanase d'Alexandrie: Lettres à Sérapion sur la divinité du Saint-Esprit*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 15. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1947.
- Lefort, L.-T., ed. and trans. *S. Athanasie: Lettres festales et pastorales en copte*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, vols. 150 and 151. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste L. Durbecq, 1955.
- Montfaucon, Bernard de, ed. *S.P.N. Athanasii archiepiscopi Alexandrini opera omnia quae exstant*. Vols. 25-28 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1857.

- Opitz, H.-G., ed. *Die Apologien*. Vol. II/1-7 of his ed., *Athanasius Werke*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935.
- Robertson, Archibald, trans. *Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 4. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1892.
- Shapland, C.R.B., trans. *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*. London: The Epworth Press, 1951.
- Thomson, R.W., ed. and trans. *Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1971.

C. BASIL OF CAESAREA

- Anderson, David, trans. *St. Basil the Great: On the Holy Spirit*. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Press, 1980.
- Clarke, W.K.L., trans. *The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil*. London: S.P.C.K., 1925.
- Courtonne, Yves, ed. and trans. *Saint Basile: Lettres*. 3 vols. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1957, 1961, 1966.
- Garnier, Julien and Prudent Maran, eds. and trans. *Sancti patris nostri Basilii Caesareae Cappadociae archiepiscopi opera omnia quae exstant*. Vols. 29-32 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1857.
- Giet, Stanislas, ed. and trans. *Basile de Césarée: Homélies sur l'Hexaéméron*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 26. 2nd ed. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968.
- Hauschild, W.-D., trans. *Basilius von Caesarea: Briefe*. Vol. 2. Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur, vol. 3. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1973.
- Jackson, Blomfield, trans. *The Treatise De Spiritu Sancto, The Nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron and the Letters of Saint Basil the Great*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 8. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895.
- Johnston, C.F.H., ed. *The Book of Saint Basil the Great, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, on the Holy Spirit*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1892.
- Neri, Umberto, ed. and trans. *Basilio di Cesarea, Il battesimo*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1976.
- Pruche, Benoît, ed. and trans. *Basile de Césarée: Sur le Saint-Esprit*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 17. 2nd ed. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1968.
- Smets, Alexis and Michel van Esbroeck, eds. and trans. *Basile de Césarée: Sur l'origine de l'homme*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 160. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970.
- Wagner, M.M., trans. *Saint Basil: Ascetical Works*. The Fathers of the Church, vol. 9. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1950.
- Way, A.C., trans. *Saint Basil: Letters*. 2 vols. The Fathers of the Church, vols. 13 and 28. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1951, 1955.
- . trans. *Saint Basil: Exegetic Homilies*. The Fathers of the Church, vol. 46. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963.

D. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS

- Barbel, Joseph, trans. *Gregor von Nazianz: Die fünf theologischen Reden*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1963.
- Browne, C.G. and J.E. Swallow, trans. *Select Orations and Letters of St. Gregory Nazianzen*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 7. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1894.
- Clémencet, Charles and D.A.B. Caillau, eds. and trans. *Sancti patris nostri*

- Gregorii Theologi, vulgo Nazianzeni, archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani. opera omnia quae extant.* Vols. 35-38 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1857-1858.
- Gallay, Paul, trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Poèmes et lettres*. Lyon: Emmanuel Vitte, [1941].
- ed. *Gregor von Nazianz Briefe*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, vol. 53. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969.
- ed. and trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres théologiques*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 208. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1974.
- and Maurice Jourjon, eds. and trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 27-31 (Discours théologiques)*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 250. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978.
- Jungck, Christoph, ed. and trans. *Gregor von Nazianz: De vita sua*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1974.
- Mason, A.J., ed. *The Five Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1899.
- Mossay, Justin and Guy Lafontaine, eds. and trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 20-23*. Sources Chrétiennes, no. 270. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1980.

E. GREGORY OF NYSSA

- Ducaeus, Fronto, ed. *S.P.N. Gregorii episcopi Nysseni opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*. Vols. 44-46 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1863.
- Heil, Gunter et al., eds. *Sermones, Pars I*. Vol. IX of Werner Jaeger and Hermann Langerbeck, eds., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Jaeger, Werner, J.P. Cavarnos and V. Woods Callahan, eds., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Asctica*. Vol. VIII/1 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963.
- Moore, William and H.A. Wilson, trans. *Select Writings and Letters of Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 5. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893.
- Mueller, Friedrich, ed. *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica, Pars I*. Vol. III/1 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958.
- Pasquali, Giorgio, ed. *Gregorii Nysseni Epistulae*. Vol. VIII/2 of Werner Jaeger, ed., *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*. 2nd ed. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959.

F. OTHER AUTHORS

- Bettenson, Henry, ed. and trans. *The Later Christian Fathers. A selection of the writings of the Fathers from St. Cyril of Jerusalem to St. Leo the Great*. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Bidez, Joseph, ed. *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines Arianischen Historiographen*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 21. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1913.
- ed. and trans. *L'Empereur Julien: Oeuvres complètes*. Vol. I/2. 2nd ed. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1960.
- and G.C. Hansen, eds. *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, vol. 50. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.
- Butterworth, Robert, ed. and trans. *Hippolytus of Rome: Contra Noëtum*. Heythrop

- Monographs, no. 2. London: Heythrop College (University of London), 1977.
- Coleman-Norton, P.R., trans. *Roman State & Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents to A.D. 535*. Vol. 1. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.
- Datema, Cornelis, ed. and trans. *Amphilochii Iconiensis Opera*. Corpus Christianorum, series graeca, vol. 3. Turnhout: Brepols/ Leuven: University Press, 1978.
- Dörries, Hermann, Erich Klostermann and Matthias Kroeger, eds. *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*. Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 4. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1964.
- Dossetti, G.L., ed. *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Constantinopoli*. Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose, vol. 2. Rome: Herder, 1967.
- Hartranft, C.D., rev. trans. *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 2. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1890.
- Henry, Paul. *Les États du texte de Plotin*. Vol. 1 of his *Études Plotiniennes*. Museum Lessianum, Section Philosophique, no. 20. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer et C^e 1938. [Contains Ps.-Basil, *DS*.]
- and H.-R. Schwyzer, eds. *Plotini Opera*. 3 vols. Museum Lessianum, Series Philosophica, vols. 33-35. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1951, 1959, 1973.
- Hilberg, Isidore, ed. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*. Vol. 3. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. 56. 1918 ed. Rpt. New York/London: Johnson Reprint Co., 1961.
- Holl, Karl, ed. *Panarion Haer. 65-80, De Fide*. Vol. 3 of his ed., *Epiphanius Ancoratus und Panarion*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 37. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933.
- Jackson, Blomfield, trans. *The Ecclesiastical History, Dialogues, and Letters of Theodoret*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 3. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1892.
- Klostermann, Erich, ed. *Gegen Marcell, Über die kirchliche Theologie, Die Fragmente Marcells*. Vol. 4 of *Eusebius Werke*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, [vol. 14]. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.
- Mommsen, Theodor, ed. *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*. Vol. I/1 of his and P.M. Meyer, eds., *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et Leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*. Berlin: Apud Weidmannos, 1905.
- Nau, F., ed. and trans. *Théodore de Mopsueste: Controverse avec les Macédoniens* in vol. 9 of R. Graffin and F. Nau, eds., *Patrologia Orientalis*. 1913 ed. Rpt. Turnhout: Editions Brepols, 1971.
- Parmentier, Léon and Felix Scheidweiler, eds. *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, vol. 44. 2nd ed. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.
- Petavius, Dionysius, ed. and trans. *S.P.N. Epiphanii Constantiae in Cypro episcopi opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*. Vols. 41-43 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1863-1864.
- Rolfe, J.C., ed. and trans. *Ammianus Marcellinus*. The Loeb Classical Library, no. 300. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press/ London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1963.
- Schulze, J.L., ed. and trans. *Theodoret Cyrensis episcopi opera omnia*. Vol. 82 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1864.
- Schwartz, Eduard, ed. *Collectio Sabaitica*. Tome III of his ed., *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1940. [Contains Justinian's *Or.*].

- Seiler, Ingrid, ed. and trans. *Didymus der Blinde: De trinitate, Buch 2, Kapitel 1-7*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, vol. 52. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1975.
- Valesius, Henricus, ed. and trans. *Socratis Scholastici, Hermiae Sozomeni Historia Ecclesiastica*. Vol. 67 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*. Paris: 1864.
- Vallarsi, Domenico, ed. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri opera omnia*. Vols. 22-30 of J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina*. Paris: 1845-1846.
- Zenos, A.C., rev. trans. *The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 2. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1890.

II. Secondary Sources

A. ORIGEN

- Brox, Norbert. "Spiritualität und Orthodoxie. Zum Konflikt des Origenes mit der Geschichte des Dogmas" in Ernst Dassmann and K. Suso Frank, eds., *Pietas. Festschrift für Bernhard Kotting*. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, vol. 8. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1980.
- Crouzel, Henri. *Origène et la 'connaissance mystique'*. Museum Lessianum, Section Théologique, no. 56. [Paris]: Desclée de Brouwer, 1961.
- . "Chronique origénienne: Wolf-Dieter Hauschild. *Gottes Geist und der Mensch: Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie*", *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique*, LXXVII (1976), 139-146.
- . "Les Personnes de la Trinité sont-elles de puissance inégale selon Origène, Peri Archon, 1,3,5-8?", *Gregorianum*, LVII (1976), 109-125.
- Daniélou, Jean. *Origen*. Trans. Walter Mitchell. London/New York: Sheed and Ward, Ltd., 1955.
- Dupuis, Jacques. *'L'Esprit de l'homme'. Étude sur l'anthropologie religieuse d'Origène*. Museum Lessianum, Section Théologique, no. 62. [Paris]: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967.
- Hauschild, W.-D. *Gottes Geist und der Mensch. Studien zur frühchristlichen Pneumatologie*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, vol. 63. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1972.
- Kettler, F.H. "Origenes", *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, IV (1960), 1692-1701.
- . *Der ursprüngliche Sinn der Dogmatik des Origenes*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, vol. 31. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.
- Lowry, C.W. "Origen as Trinitarian", *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVII (1936), 225-240.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Origène. Sa vie et son oeuvre*. Christianisme Antique, vol. 1. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.
- Saake, Helmut. "Der Tractatus pneumatico-philosophicus des Origenes in Περὶ ἀρχῶν I,3", *Hermes*, CI (1973), 91-114.
- Simonetti, Manlio. "Note sulla teologia trinitaria di Origene", *Vetera Christianorum*, VIII (1971), 273-307.

B. ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

- Armstrong, C.B. "The Synod of Alexandria and the Schism at Antioch in A.D. 362", *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXII (1921), 206-221, 347-355.
- Barnes, Timothy D. *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Bernard, Régis. *L'Image de Dieu d'après saint Athanase*. Théologie, vol. 25. Paris: Aubier, 1952.
- Campbell, T.C. "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, XXVII (1974), 408-440.
- Christou, Panachiotis. "Uncreated and created, unbegotten and begotten in the theology of Athanasius of Alexandria", *Augustinianum*, XIII (1973), 399-409.
- Dragas, George. "Holy Spirit and Tradition. The Writings of St. Athanasius", *Sobornost*, I (1979), 51-72.
- Florovsky, Georges. "The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius" in F.L. Cross, ed., *Studia Patristica*. Vol. VI. Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 81. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.
- Frend, W.H.C. "Athanasius as an Egyptian Christian Leader in the Fourth Century", *New College Bulletin*, VIII (1974), 20-37.
- Gentz, G. "Athanasius", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, I (1950), 860-866.
- Gregg, R.C. and D.E. Groh. *Early Arianism A View of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- Handspicker, M.B. "Athanasius on Tradition and Scripture", *Andover Newton Quarterly*, n.s., III (1962), 13-29.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "Athanasius von Alexandrien. Seine Beziehungen zu Trier und seine Rolle in der Geschichte der christlichen Theologie", *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*, LXXXII (1973), 141-153.
- . "Athanasius of Alexandria and the Foundation of Traditional Christology", *Theological Studies*, XXXIV (1973), 103-113.
- Laeuchli, Samuel. "The Case of Athanasius Against Arius", *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXX (1959), 403-420.
- Laminski, Adolf. *Der Heilige Geist als Geist Christi und Geist der Gläubigen. Der Beitrag des Athanasios von Alexandrien zur Formulierung des trinitarischen Dogmas im vierten Jahrhundert*. Erfurter theologische Studien, vol. 23. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag GMBH, 1969.
- Louth, Andrew. "Reason and Revelation in Saint Athanasius", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, XXIII (1970), 385-396.
- Meijering, E.P. *Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Synthesis or Antithesis?* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.
- Müller, Guido. *Lexicon Athanasianum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1952.
- Opitz, H.-G. *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. 23. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1935.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Light of the World*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publ., 1962.
- Pollard, T.E. "The Exegesis of Scripture and the Arian Controversy", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XLI (1958-1959), 414-429.
- . *Johannine Christology and the Early Church*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970.

- Ritschl, Dietrich. *Athanasius. Versuch einer Interpretation*. Theologische Studien, vol. 76. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1964.
- . *Memory and Hope: An Inquiry Concerning the Presence of Christ*. New York: The Macmillan Co./London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1967.
- Rodzianko, V. "'Filioque' in Patristic Thought", in Kurt Aland and F.L. Cross, eds., *Studia Patristica*. Vol. II. Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 64. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- Roldanus, Johannes. *Le Christ et l'homme dans la théologie d'Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought, vol. 4. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968.
- Saake, Helmut. "Das Präskript zum ersten Serapionsbrief des Athanasius von Alexandria als pneumatologisches Programm", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXVI (1972), 188-199.
- . "Beobachtungen zur Athanasianischen Pneumatologie", *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie*, XV (1973), 348-364.
- . "La Notion de la Trinité à visée pansotériologique chez Origène et son déplacement intra-ecclésial/chez Athanase d'Alexandrie" in Charles Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Théologie Historique, vol. 27. Paris: Beauchesne, 1974.
- Sieben, H.J. "Herméneutique de l'exégèse dogmatique d'Athanase" in Charles Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Théologie Historique, vol. 27. Paris: Beauchesne, 1974.
- Smythe, H.R. "The Interpretation of Amos 4¹³ in St. Athanasius and Didymus", *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., I (1950), 158-168.
- . "Reviews: *The Letters of Saint Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*, translated with Introduction and Notes by C.R.B. Shapland", *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., III (1952), 120-121.
- Stead, G.C. "The Concept of Divine Substance", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXIX (1975), 1-14.
- . "Rhetorical Method in Athanasius", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXX (1976), 121-137.
- . *Divine Substance*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Tetz, Martin. "Athanasiana", *Vigiliae Christianae*, IX (1955), 159-175.
- . "Zur Edition der dogmatischen Schriften des Athanasius von Alexandrien", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXVII (1955-1956), 1-28.
- . "Übernikäische Orthodoxie", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LXVI (1975), 194-222.
- . "Athanasius von Alexandrien", *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, IV (1979), 333-349.
- . "Zur Biographie des Athanasius von Alexandrien", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XC (1979), 304-338.
- Torrance, T.F. "Spiritus Creator: A Consideration of the teaching of St. Athanasius and St. Basil" in his *Theology in Reconstruction*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1965.
- . "Athanasius: A Study in the Foundations of Classical Theology" in his *Theology in Reconciliation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1976.
- Walker, J.B. "Convenance épistémologique de l' 'Homoousion' dans la théologie d'Athanase" in Charles Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Théologie Historique, vol. 27. Paris: Beauchesne, 1974.

C. BASIL OF CAESAREA

- Abramowski, Luise. "Das Bekenntnis des Gregor Thaumaturgus", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXXVII(1976), 145-166.
- Amand, David [Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta]. *L'Ascèse monastique de saint Basile*. Maredsous: Editions Maredsous, 1948.
- . *The 'Unwritten' and 'Secret' APOSTOLIC TRADITIONS in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea*. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, no. 13. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.
- . "The Pair KHPYΓMA and ΔΟΓΜΑ in the Theological Thought of St. Basil of Caesarea", *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., XVI (1965), 129-142.
- . "The Official Attitude of Basil of Caesarea as a Christian Bishop towards Greek Philosophy and Science" in Derek Baker, ed., *The Orthodox Churches and the West*. Studies in Church History, vol. 13. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976.
- Barmann, B.C. "The Cappadocian Triumph Over Arianism". Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1966.
- Bilaniuk, P.B.T. "The Monk as Pneumatophor in the Writings of St. Basil the Great", *Diakonia*, XV (1980), 49-63.
- Bobrinskoy, Boris. "Liturgie et ecclésiologie trinitaire de saint Basile", *Verbum Caro*, LXXXIX (1969), 1-32.
- Cavalcanti, Elena. "'Theognosia' per mezzo dello Spirito e inconoscibilità dello Spirito nel *De Spiritu Sancto* di Basilio di Cesarea", *Augustinianum*, XIX (1979), 403-414.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Literarische Berichte und Anzeigen: Hermann Dörries: *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXIX (1958), 335-337.
- Clarke, W.K.L. *St. Basil the Great. A Study in Monasticism*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1913.
- Dehnhard, Hans. *Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilius von Plotin. Quellenuntersuchungen zu seinen Schriften De Spiritu Sancto*. Patristische Texte und Studien, vol. 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1964.
- Dörries, Hermann. *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, no. 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- . "Basilius und das Dogma vom Heiligen Geist" in his *Wort und Stunde*. Vol. I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Donovan, M.A. "The Spirit, Place of the Sanctified". Unpublished paper, 1979.
- Fedwick, P.J. *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea*. Studies and Texts, vol. 45. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979.
- Gribomont, Jean. "H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas*", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, L (1957), 452-453.
- . "Saint Basile" in *Théologie de la vie monastique. Études sur la tradition patristique*. Théologie, vol. 49. Paris: Aubier, 1961.
- . "L'Origénisme de saint Basile" in *L'Homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac*. Vol. I. Théologie, vol. 56. Paris: Aubier, 1963.
- . "Le Paulinisme de saint Basile" in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961*. Vol. II. Analecta Biblica, vol. 18. Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963.
- . "Comptes rendus: Hans Dehnhard. *Das Problem der Abhängigkeit des Basilius*

- von Plotin. *Quellenuntersuchungen zu seinen Schriften 'De Spiritu Sancto' "*, *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, LX (1965) 487-492.
- . "Esotérisme et tradition dans le *Traité du Saint-Esprit* de saint Basile", *Oecumenica*, II (1967), 22-56.
- . "Basil, St.", *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, II (1967), 143-146.
- . "Les Succès littéraires des Pères grecs et les problèmes d'histoire des textes", *Sacris Erudiri*, XXII (1974-1975), 23-49.
- . "Intransigence and Irenicism in Saint Basil's 'De Spiritu Sancto' ", *Word and Spirit*, I (1979), 109-136.
- Hanson, R.P.C. "Basil's Doctrine of Tradition in Relation to the Holy Spirit", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXII (1968), 241-255.
- . "Dogma and Formula in the Fathers" in E.A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica*. Vol. XIII. Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 116. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975.
- Hauschild, W.-D. "Basilios von Cäsarea", *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, V (1980), 301-313.
- Haykin, Michael A. G. "And who is the Spirit? Basil of Caesarea's Letters to the Church at Tarsus", *Vigiliae Christianae*, 41 (1987), 377-385.
- Heising, Alkuin. "Der Heilige Geist und die Heiligung der Engel in der Pneumatologie des Basilios von Cäsarea", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LXXXVII (1965), 257-308.
- Hornus, J.M. "La Divinité du Saint-Esprit comme condition du salut personnel selon Basile", *Verbum Caro*, LXXXIX (1969), 33-62.
- Jaeger, Werner. "Basilios und der Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas", *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXXIII (1958), 255-258.
- Karam, Cyril. "Saint Basil on the Holy Spirit — Some Aspects of His Theology", *Word and Spirit*, I (1979), 137-164.
- Kretschmar, Georg. "Der Heilige Geist in der Geschichte. Grundzüge frühchristlicher Pneumatologie", in Walter Kasper, ed., *Gegenwart des Geistes. Aspekte der Pneumatologie*. Quaestiones Disputatae, vol. 85. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1979.
- May, Gerhard. "Einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis Gregors von Nyssa zu Basilios dem Grossen" in Jacques Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser, eds., *EPEKTASIS. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.
- Orphanos, M.A. *Creation and Salvation according to St. Basil of Caesarea*. Athens: [G. Parisianos], 1975.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. "The 'Spiritual Sense' of Scripture. The Exegetical Basis for St. Basil's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit" in P.J. Fedwick, ed., *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981.
- Prestige, G.L. *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*. Ed. from his papers by Henry Chadwick. London: S.P.C.K., 1956.
- Pruche, Benoît. "L'Originalité du traité de saint Basile sur le Saint-Esprit", *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, XXXII (1948), 207-221.
- . "Autour du Traité sur le Saint-Esprit de saint Basile de Césarée", *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, LII (1964), 204-232.
- Reilly, G.F. *Imperium and Sacerdotium according to St. Basil the Great*. The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, no. 7. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1945.
- Riedmatten, Henri de. "La Correspondence entre Basile de Césarée et Apollinaire

- de Laodicée", *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., VII (1956), 199-210; VIII (1957), 53-70.
- Rist, J.M. "Basil's 'Neoplatonism': Its Background and Nature" in P.J. Fedwick ed., *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1981.
- Scazzoso, Piero. "San Basilio e la Sacra Scrittura", *Aevum*, XLVII (1973), 210-224.
- . *Introduzione alla ecclesiologia di san Basilio*. Studia Patristica Mediolanensia, vol. 4. Milan: Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1975.
- Špidlík, Thomas. *La Sophiologie de saint Basile*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta, no. 162. Rome: Pontificum Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1961.
- Staats, Reinhart. "Die Basilianische Verherrlichung des Heiligen Geistes auf dem Konzil zu Konstantinopel 381", *Kerygma und Dogma*, XXV (1979), 232-253.
- Stritzky, Maria Barbara von. "Das Theodizeeproblem in der Sicht des Basilios von Caesarea" in Sencer Şahin, Elmar Schwertheim and Jörg Wagner, eds., *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasien. Festschrift für Friedrich Dörner*. Vol. II. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1978.
- Verhees, J.J. "Pneuma, Erfahrung und Erleuchtung in der Theologie des Basilios des Grossen", *Ostkirchliche Studien*, XXV (1976), 43-59.
- . "Die Bedeutung des Transzendenz des Pneuma des Basilios", *Ostkirchliche Studien*, XXV (1976), 285-302.
- . "Mitteilbarkeit Gottes in der Dynamik von Sein und Wirken nach der Trinitätstheologie des Basilios des Grossen", *Ostkirchliche Studien*, XXVII (1978), 3-24.
- Woolcombe, K.J. "Reviews: *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea*. By the late G.L. Prestige. Edited from his papers by Henry Chadwick", *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., IX (1958), 154-164.
- Yamamura, Kei. "The Development of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Patristic Philosophy: St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa", trans. H.G. Seraphim, *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, XVIII (1974), 3-21.

D. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS

- Bellini, Enzo. "Il dogma trinitario nei primi discorsi di Gregorio Nazianzeno", *Augustinianum*, XIII (1973), 525-534.
- Gallay, Paul. *La Vie de saint Grégoire de Nazianze*. Lyon: Emmanuel Vitte, 1943.
- Hauschild, W.-D. "Buchbesprechungen: *Gregor von Nazianz: De vita sua*. Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und erklärt von Christoph Jungck", *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum*, IX (1977), 213-216.
- Meijering, E.P. "The Doctrine of the Will and of the Trinity in the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus", *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*, XXVII (1973), 224-234.
- Mossay, Justin. "Gregor von Nazianz in Konstantinopel (379-381 A.D.)", *Byzantion*, XLVII (1977), 223-238.
- Norris, F.W. "Gregory Nazianzen's Doctrine of Jesus Christ". Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1970.
- Plagnieux, Jean. *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze théologien*. Paris: Éditions Franciscaines, 1951.
- Ritter, A.M. "Zum homousios von Nizäa und Konstantinopel. Kritische Nachlese zu einigen neueren Diskussionen" in his ed., *Kerygma und Logos. Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

- Rousse, Jacques. "Grégoire de Nazianze", *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, VI (1967), 932-971.
- Ruether, R.R. *Gregory of Nazianzus: Rhetor and Philosopher*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Szymusiak, J.M. "Pour une chronologie des discours de S. Grégoire de Nazianze", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XX (1966), 183-189.
- . "Grégoire le théologien disciple d'Athanase" in Charles Kannengiesser, ed., *Politique et théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie*. Théologie Historique, vol. 27. Paris: Beauchesne, 1974.
- Ullmann, C. *Gregorius von Nazianz der Theologe*. 2nd ed. Gotha: Verlag von Friedrich Berthes, 1866.
- Winslow, D.F. *The Dynamics of Salvation. A Study in Gregory of Nazianzus*. Patristic Monograph Series, no. 7. Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation Ltd., 1979.

E. GREGORY OF NYSSA

- Daniélou, Jean. "La Chronologie des sermons de Grégoire de Nysse", *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, XXIX (1955), 346-372.
- . "La Chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse" in F.L. Cross, ed., *Studia Patristica*. Vol. VII. Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 92. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966.
- . "Bulletin d'histoire des origines chrétiennes: Adolf-Martin Ritter. *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*", *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, LV (1967), 105-113.
- . "Bulletin d'histoire des origines chrétiennes: Werner Jaeger. *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*", *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, LV (1967), 115-118.
- . "Chrismation prébaptismale et divinité de l'esprit chez Grégoire de Nysse", *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, LVI (1968), 177-198.
- Harl, Marguerite. "'From Glory to Glory'. L'interprétation de II Cor. 3,18b par Grégoire de Nysse et la liturgie baptismale" in Patrick Granfield and J.A. Jungmann, eds., *Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. Vol. II. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1970.
- Hübner, Reinhard. "Gregor von Nyssa und Markell von Ankrya" in Marguerite Harl, ed., *Écriture et culture philosophique la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971.
- Jaeger, Werner. *Gregor von Nyssa's Lehre vom Heiligen Geist*. Ed. by Hermann Dörries. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966.
- May, Gerhard. "Gregor von Nyssa in der Kirchenpolitik seiner Zeit", *Jahrbuch der osterreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, XV (1966), 105-132.
- . "Die Datierung der Rede 'In suam ordinationem' des Gregor von Nyssa und die Verhandlungen mit den Pneumatomachen auf dem Konzil von Konstantinopel 381", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXIII (1969), 38-57.
- . "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa" in Marguerite Harl, ed., *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971.
- Parmentier, Martien. "Saint Gregory of Nyssa's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit", *Ekklesiastikos Pharos*, LVIII (1976), 41-100, 387-444; LIX (1977), 323-429; LX (1978), 697-730.
- Quispel, Gilles. "Gregorius van Nyssa en de mystiek", *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*, XXIV (1969-1970), 250-255.

- Ritter, A.M. "Gregor von Nyssa, 'In suam ordinationem'. Eine Quelle für die Geschichte des Konzils von Konstantinopel 381?", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXXIX (1968), 308-328.
- Staats, Reinhart. "Die Asketen aus Mesopotamien in der Rede des Gregor von Nyssa 'In suam ordinationem'", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXI (1967), 165-179.
- . "Die Datierung von 'In suam ordinationem' des Gregor von Nyssa", *Vigiliae Christianae*, XXIII (1969), 58-59.
- Verhees, J.J. "Die 'ΕΝΕΠΤΕΙΑΙ des Pneumas als Beweis für seine Transzendenz in der Argumentation des Gregor von Nyssa", *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XLV (1979), 5-31.

F. THE PNEUMATOMACHI

- Frazee, C.A. "Anatolian Asceticism in the Fourth Century: Eustathios of Sebastea and Basil of Caesarea", *The Catholic Historical Review*, LXVI (1980), 16-33.
- Gribomont, Jean. "Eustathe de Sébaste", *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, IV/2 (1961), 1708-1712.
- . "Eustathe de Sébaste", *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*, XVI (1967), 26-33.
- Hauschild, W.-D. "Die Pneumatomachen. Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts". Unpublished theological dissertation, University of Hamburg, 1967.
- Heron, Alasdair. "Zur Theologie der 'Tropici' in den Serapionbriefen des Athanasius", *Kyrios*, XIV, (1974), 3-24.
- Loofs, Friedrich. *Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe*. Halle A.S.: Max Niemeyer, 1898.
- . "Eustathius of Sebaste", *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, IV (1909), 214-215.
- . "Macedonianism", *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, VIII (1916), 225-230.
- Meinhold, Peter. "Pneumatomachoi", *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, XXI/1 (1951), 1066-1101.
- Riedmatten, Henri de. "Éleusius de Cyzique", *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*, XV (1963), 144-145.
- Ritter, A.M. "Literarische Berichte und Anzeigen: W.-D. Hauschild: Die Pneumatomachen. Eine Untersuchung zur Dogmengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXXX (1969), 397-406.
- Salaville, S. "Eustathe de Sébaste", *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, V/2 (1939), 1565-1571.
- Venables, Edmund. "Eustathius (4)", *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, II (1877), 383-387.
- Zucchetti, Fausta. "Eustazio di Sebaste e Basilio di Cesarea", *Ricerche religiose*, II (1926), 17-22.

G. OTHER WORKS

- Andresen, Carl. "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LII (1961), 1-39.
- Badcock, F.J. "The Council of Constantinople and the Nicene Creed", *Journal of Theological Studies*, XVI (1915), 205-225.
- Baus, Karl et al. *The Imperial Church from Constantine to the Early Middle Ages*. Trans. Anselm Biggs. New York: The Seabury Press, 1980.

- Bernardi, Jean. *La Prédication des pères cappadociens. Le prédicateur et son auditoire*. [Paris]: Presses Universitaires de France, [1968].
- Bolgiani, Franco. "La Théologie de l'Esprit Saint. De la fin du I^{er} siècle après Jésus Christ au concile de Constantinople (381)", *Quatres Fleuves*, IX (1979), 33-72.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. Trans. Stanley Godman. New York: Pantheon Books Inc., 1959.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Early Church*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1973.
- Dewar, Lindsay. *The Holy Spirit and Modern Thought*. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1959.
- Dörries, Hermann. *Die Theologie des Makarios/Symeon*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, no. 103. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Greer, R.A. *The Captain of our Salvation. A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, vol. 15. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Trans. John Bowden. Vol. I. 2nd ed. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Groh, D.E. "Changing Points of View in Patristic Scholarship", *Anglican Theological Review*, LX (1978), 447-465.
- Gwatkin, H.M. *Studies of Arianism*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1900.
- Halleux, A. de "La Profession de l'Esprit-Saint dans le symbole de Constantinople", *Revue Théologique de Louvain*, X (1979), 5-39.
- Harnack, Adolf. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. Vols. I and II. 3rd ed. Freiburg I.B./Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1894.
- Heron, Alasdair. "The Holy Spirit in Origen and Didymus the Blind: a shift in perspective from the third to the fourth century" in A.M. Ritter, ed., *Kerygma und Logos. Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Holl, Karl. *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum. Eine Studie zu Symeon dem Neuen Theologen*. 1896 ed. Rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1969.
- *Amphilochius von Ikonium und seine Verhältnisse zu den grossen Kappadoziern*. 1904 ed. Rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3rd. ed. London: Longman, 1972.
- King, N.Q. *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1961.
- Kretschmar, Georg. *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, vol. 21. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956.
- "Le Développement de la doctrine du Saint-Esprit du Nouveau Testament à Nicée", *Verbum Caro*, LXXXVIII (1968), 5-55.
- Lampe, G.W.H. *The Seal of the Spirit*. London/New York/Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951.
- "Christian Theology in the Patristic Period" in Herbert Cunliffe-Jones and Benjamin Drewery, eds., *A History of Christian Doctrine*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1978.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule. Texte und Untersuchungen*. 1904 ed. Rpt. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms, 1970.
- *From Constantine to Julian*. Trans. B.L. Woolf. 2nd ed. London: Lutterworth Press, 1960.

- . *The Era of the Church Fathers*. Trans. B.L. Woolf. 2nd ed. London: Lutterworth Press, 1960.
- Louth, Andrew. *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition. From Plato to Denys*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- McIntyre, John. "The Holy Spirit in Greek Patristic Thought", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, VII (1954), 353-375.
- Marsh, Thomas. "Holy Spirit in Early Christian Teaching", *The Irish Theological Quarterly*, XLV (1978), 101-116.
- Mühlenberg, Ekkehard. *Apollinaris von Laodicea*. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Otis, Brooks. "Cappadocian Thought as a Coherent System", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XII (1958), 97-124.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Vol. 1 of his *The Christian Tradition*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Prestige, G.L. *God in Patristic Thought*. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1936.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Utrecht/Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers/Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950, 1953, 1960.
- Ritter, A.M. *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol*. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II. Ökumenischen Konzils. Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Schwartz, Eduard. "Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXIV (1935), 129-213.
- Simonetti, Manlio. *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*. Rome: Institutum Patristicum 'Augustinianum', 1975.
- Swete, H.B. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church. A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers*. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1912.
- Tillemont, Louis Sébastien le Nain de. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*. Vol. 9. Paris: 1703.
- Wiles, M.F. *The Divine Apostle. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.
- . *The Making of Christian Doctrine. A Study in the Principles of Early Doctrinal Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Alexandria, Synod of (362) 23-24, 35, 37
- Anastasia, Church of the 171 and n.14
- Apostles, Church of the 179 and n.64
- Angels 121-129
- Anomoeans 25, 46, 195, 197
- Antioch in Caria, Synod of (378) 178
- Arians 46, 63-64, 111, 170, 195, 204, 208, 214, 216, 227
- Athanasius' *Ep. Serap.*, dating of 19-21, 59 and n.5; —, composition of 59-62
- Baptism 129-137, 166, 191, 192
- Baptismal formula 46-47, 53, 56, 117, 120-121, 128, 130, 151, 168
- Basil's *Spir.*, occasion of 43-45; —, composition of 105-113
- Chrismation 133
- Constantinople, Council of (381) 8, 179-184, 188, 193, 194, 199-201, 202; —, Nicene community of 170-172, 204, 206, 207; —, Synod of (360) 33, 179
- Cyzicus, Synod of (376) 45, 110, 177-178
- Deification 91-92, 102, 164-165, 176
- Exegesis, of Athanasius 63-67, 100, 227-228; —, of Basil of Caesarea 114-120, 131-132; —, patristic 3-4, 230
- God, likened to a fountain 73-76; —, the incomprehensibility of 69-72, 100, 137-138, 212; —, ingeneracy of 137; —, unchangeability of 81-82
- History, God's work in 136
- Holy Spirit, and the charismata 147-152, *passim*, 196-198, 210; —, and the confession of Christ 121, 123-125, 128-129, 167, 190; —, "creation" of 13-15, 208; —, and the creation of angels 121-129, *passim*; —, a creature 21, 30-31, 56, 61-62, 65-66, 144; —, giver of the knowledge of God 81, 84-85, 101, 119, 125-129, 141, 142, 146-147, 165, 168, 209, 222, 223-224, 229; —, glorification of 45, 49, 105-106, 139, 159-161, 169, 183, 190, 191, 199, 223; —, and glossolalia 147-148, n.230; —, gradual revelation about 175; —, holiness of 37-38; —, ineffability of 83, 146, 168-169, 176; —, and inspiration 97-100, 158-159; —, an intermediate being 27, n.86, 154-156, 172, 189-190, 226; —, as "kingship" 191; —, likened to a draught of water 75-76; —, lordship of 149-150, 153-156, 167, 224, 226, 229; —, mode of existence of 56, 143-147, 168, 175-176, 216-217, 221; —, origin of 68-70, 79; —, and participation in God 90, 91-92, 102, 138-139, 219-220; —, procession of 145, 168, 176, 227; —, and sanctification 86-88, 119, 122-125, 162-165, 166, 167, 188, 210, 219, 220-223; —, and the transformation of believers 157-158, 167-168, 226; —, unchangeability of 81-82, 101, 214; —, uncreated nature of 77-92, *passim*, 100-101, 216; —, as unction 88-90; —, uniqueness of 83-86, 213, 224; —, worship of 83, 184, 192-193
- Homoeans 33-34, 41, 57, 179, 184
- Homoiousians 27, n.86; 30, n.102; 35; 39, n.151; 111; 177
- Iconium, Synod of (376) 46-47, 182
- Messalianism 106, 198
- Middle Platonism 210
- Monarchianism, Modalistic 14, 50-51
- Monasticism 1, 24-25, 26-27, 31-33, 54, 55, 106, 114, 124, 142-143 and n.211, 162, 196-199, 213, 224

- Oneness in being 34, 35, 76, 79-83, 99,
n.228, 100, 101, 107, 173, 181, 183,
184, 186, 201, 214, 217
- Sabellianism 42, 56, 139-140, 146, 152-
153, 169, 214-216, 228
- Salvation 66, 101-102
- Scripture, illustrations of 71-76, 101;
—, inspiration of 97-100; —, medi-
tation on 156, 158-159, 226; —, and
tradition 93-94
- Son of God, the image of God 127-128;
—, likened to a river 73-76
- Tradition 93-94, 116-117
- Trinity 23, 56, 66, 67, 71, 93-97, 150-
151, 166, 172, 178, 183, 213, 222,
228; —, hierarchy in the 11-13, 16;
—, coinherence of 75, 95-97, 213
- Worship 103, 163, 169

INDEX OF PERSONS

Note: There are no separate entries for either Athanasius and Basil

- Aëtius 126-127, n.135
 Alexander of Alexandria 218
 Amand de Mendieta, Emmanuel 109
 Amphilochius of Iconium 18, 44, 46-47, 105, 108, 111, 115, 182, 199, 220
 Antiochus 32
 Antony 63, 213
 Apollinaris of Laodicea 39, 42-43, 152-153, 215
 Arius 37, 39
 Ascholius of Thessalonica 182, 194
 Atarbius of Neocaesarea 215
- Bardenhewer, Otto 60
 Bardy, Gustave 60, 202
 Basil, a disciple of Eustathius of Sebaste 28-29
 Batiffol, Pierre 171
 Bernardi, Jean 56-57, 204, 205, 206, 207
 Bienert, W. A. 50, 51
 Bloomquist, L.G. ix
 Bolgiani, Franco 10, 51
- Campenhausen, Hans von 114
 Cavalcanti, Elena ix
 Chadwick, Henry 109-110
 Christou, Panachiotis 78
 Clarke, W. K. L. 53
 Constans 18
 Constantius II 18-19, 22
 Cummings, J. T. 202
 Cyriacus of Tarsus 30
 Cyril of Jerusalem 212, 214
- Damasus of Rome 206
 Daniélou, Jean 133, 193, 200
 Dazizas 42, 43, 152, 215
 De Halleux, André 200, 217
 Demophilus 170, 179, 204
 Demosthenes 40-41
 Dewar, Lindsay 133
 Dianius 32
 Didymus the Blind 104
- Dinoysius of Alexandria 17, 50-52
 Dionysius of Rome 50-51
 Diodore of Tarsus 186, 199
 Donovan, Mary Ann ix
 Dörries, Hermann 1, 5, 31, 43, 47, 53-54, 57-58, 105, 106-107, 108-113, 129, 197
- Ecdicius 41
 Egan, G. A. 60
 Egan, John P. ix
 Eleusinius 28
 Eleusius of Cyzicus 45, 177-179, 196, 204
 Epiphanius of Salamis 48
 Eunomius 25, 45 and n.205, 110, 137-138, 140, 178
 Eupaterius 115
 Eupsychius 44, 105, 109
 Eusebius of Caesarea, Cappadocia 24
 Eusebius of Caesarea, Palestine 17-18
 Eusebius of Samosata 35, 186
 Eustathius of Antioch 33-34
 Eustathius of Sebaste 7, 26-30, 33-48, 54-55, 106, 108-113, 120, 130-131, 134, 136, 137, 139, 143, 146, 152, 154, 155, 159-160, 166, 177-178, 186, 189, 196, 215, 226
 Eustathius, a correspondent of Nyssen 187
 Euzoïus 33
- Fedwick, Paul J. ix, 47-48, 54-55, 109
 Fronto 40
- Gallay, Paul 171, 202, 205, 206, 207
 Geerard, M. 60
 Gelasius 39
 Gratian 185
 Greer, Rowan 3, 5-6, 116
 Gregg, R. C. 102
 Gregory of Nazianzus 7-8, 31, 44, 55, 63, 170-185, 193, 194, 196, 199, 202-207, 227

- Gregory of Nyssa 7, 8, 41, 48, 105, 185-201, 221, 223, 225, 229
 Gregory Thaumaturgus 177, n.49; 224; 226
 Gribomont, Jean 55, 107, 109, 110
 Groh, D. E. 102

 Handspicker, M. B. 93
 Hanson, R. P. C. 109
 Harnack, Adolf von 2-3
 Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter ix, 41, 112, 113, 160, 205
 Heising, Alkuin 109, 123-124
 Helladius 200
 Heron, Alasdair ix, 212
 Holl, Karl 47
 Hürth, X. 171

 Innocent 32, 49
 Irenaeus of Lyons 2

 Jaeger, Werner 107, 193, 199, 200
 Jerome 182
 Jocz, J. ix
 John, a presbyter in Asia Minor 32
 Johnston, C. F. H. 56, 57
 Julian 22-23
 Jungck, Christoph 171
 Justinian 12

 Kannengiesser, Charles 64
 Kretschmar, Georg 133

 Laminski, Adolf 5, 60, 64, 85
 Lampe, G. W. H. 220
 Lebon, Joseph 60
 Liberius 195-196
 Lienhard, Joseph T. 215
 Lietzmann, Hans 43
 Lippl, Joseph 60
 Loofs, Friedrich 45-46, 194

 Macarius-Symeon 197-199
 Magnentius 18
 Maran, Prudent 53
 Marcellus of Ancyra 1, 215
 Marcianus of Lampascus 35, n.130; 179
 Marsh, Thomas 2
 Maximus 179, 205-206
 May, Gerhard 179, 194, 200
 Meinhold, Peter 45-46

 Meletius of Antioch 33-37, 143, 152-153, 170, 171, 179-180, 185, 186, 193, 200
 Mennas of Constantinople 12
 Montfaucon, Bernard 63

 Nicephorus Callistus 199, 200

 Opitz, H.-G. 60
 Origen 6, 9-18, 50-52, 124, 125, 129, 131, 142, 156, 208-212, 214, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 226, 228-229
 Otis, Brooks 125

 Palanque, J.-R. 202
 Palladius 32, 49
 Patrophilus of Aegea 110
 Paulinus of Antioch 34, 185
 Pelikan, Jaroslav 116, 139, 151, 220
 Peter of Alexandria 179, 205-207
 Peter of Sebaste 48
 Pierius 17
 Plotinus 107, n.20
 Poimenius 109
 Prestige, G. L. 2
 Pruche, Benoît 106, 109, 110-112

 Quasten, Johannes 60
 Quispel, Gilles 198

 Rist, John M. ix
 Ritschl, Dietrich 64
 Ritter, A. M. 1-2, 177, 179, 181, 194, 199, 203-204, 205
 Roldanus, Johannes 60, 96
 Rufinus 11-12

 Saake, Helmut 60
 Sabellius 50, 215
 Serapion of Thmuis 18, 19, 20-24, 59, 61, 62, 67, 100, 102, 146, 212, 213
 Shein, L. G. ix
 Shapland, C. R. B. 1, 60, 62-63, 87
 Silvanus of Tarsus 30, 196
 Socrates 113
 Sophronius 28-29
 Staats, Reinhart ix, 193-194, 197
 Stackhouse, Reginald F. ix
 Stülcken, Alfred 60

- Swete, H. B. 1
Szymusiak, J. M. 205

Terence, Count 31, 36-37
Tertullian 51
Theonas 17
Theodore of Mopsuestia 217
Theodosius I 170, 178-180, 183, 185,
206-207
Theodotus of Nicopolis 33-37, 143
Theognostus 17
Theophilus of Castabala 38-39, 196

Tillemont, Pierre 171
Timothy of Alexandria 182, 194
Turner, H. E. W. 3

Valens 24, 28, 34, 57, 170, 179, 185
Verhees, J. J. 116, 220

Walker, J. B. 77
Williams, G. H. 2
Wiles, M. F. 1

Yamamura, Kei 109, 127

INDEX OF REFERENCES TO ANCIENT TEXTS

Amphilochius, <i>ep. syn.</i>	46-47	<i>ep.</i> 125	37-38, 108, 111, 112, 143-144
Athanasius, <i>Ar.</i> 1-3	77	<i>ep.</i> 129	42 and n.183, 152-153, 154
<i>Ar.</i> 1.14	74-75	<i>ep.</i> 134	110, 111
<i>Ar.</i> 1.47	88-89	<i>ep.</i> 159	111, 112, 115
<i>Ar.</i> 3.15	86	<i>ep.</i> 207.1	215
<i>Ar.</i> 3.24	91	<i>ep.</i> 214.4	220
<i>decr.</i> 15.4	74	<i>ep.</i> 223	43
<i>Dion.</i> 17	50-51	<i>ep.</i> 223.5	110
<i>ep. Jo. et Ant.</i>	32	<i>ep.</i> 226.3	222
<i>ep. Jov.</i>	103	<i>ep.</i> 244	42
<i>ep. Pall.</i>	32-33	<i>ep.</i> 244.9	110
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1	21-22	<i>ep.</i> 251.4	113
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.17	70, 71	<i>ep.</i> 258	48-49
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.19	75	<i>ep.</i> 263	47-48
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.20	72-73, 75-76, 83	<i>Eun.</i> 1-3	7, 25-26, 137
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.21	77	<i>Eun.</i> 1.13-14	137-138, 140
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.22	78-79, 81-82, 216	<i>Eun.</i> 1.17	127
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.22-23	87-88	<i>Eun.</i> 3.3	153-154, 226
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.22-27	140	<i>Eun.</i> 3.4	138-139, 140, 149-150, 223, 224
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.23	89-90	<i>Eun.</i> 3.5	164
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.24	90, 91-92	<i>Eun.</i> 3.6	138, 140, 144
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.26	81, 82	<i>fid.</i>	33, 53-55, 114
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.27	85-86	<i>hom.</i> 13.2	132-133, 134
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.28	93-94	<i>hom.</i> 15.3	50, 224
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.30	94-95	<i>hom.</i> 20.3	141
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.30-31	95-96, 102	<i>hom.</i> 24	56-58, 144-145, 165, 221-222, 227
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 1.31	88, 97-100	<i>hom. in Ps.</i> 29.7	157
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 3.1-2	79-82	<i>hom. in Ps.</i> 32	58
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 3.3	92	<i>hom. in Ps.</i> 48.3, 8-9	158
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 3.3-4	84-86	<i>Spir.</i> 1	105
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 3.5	98-100	<i>Spir.</i> 2-8	105
<i>ep. Serap.</i> 3.5-6	96-97	<i>Spir.</i> 6-8	106, 111
<i>tom.</i> 3	23, 38	<i>Spir.</i> 9	106-108, 117- 119, 157, 161- 162, 163, 166, 224
Basil, <i>ep.</i> 79	28 and n.90	<i>Spir.</i> 10-27	106, 108-113
<i>ep.</i> 92	29, 35	<i>Spir.</i> 10-16	109
<i>ep.</i> 99	36-37	<i>Spir.</i> 10.24	130
<i>ep.</i> 105	30-31, 54, 111, 112, 115		
<i>ep.</i> 113	30		
<i>ep.</i> 114	30-31		
<i>ep.</i> 119	29		

<i>Spir.</i> 10.26	120-121, 129	<i>or.</i> 42	183
<i>Spir.</i> 11.27	121, 128-129	<i>or.</i> 43	184
<i>Spir.</i> 12.28	130	Gregory of Nyssa,	
<i>Spir.</i> 14.31	131-133	<i>ep.</i> 38.4	225
<i>Spir.</i> 14.32-33	134-136	<i>Maced.</i>	188-193, 200, 223
<i>Spir.</i> 15.35	133-134	<i>ordin.</i>	193-199
<i>Spir.</i> 16.37	147-152	<i>tres dii</i>	225
<i>Spir.</i> 16.38	121-125, 129, 142, 145	<i>trin.</i>	187-188
<i>Spir.</i> 16.40	137, 139, 214	Macarius-Symeon,	
<i>Spir.</i> 17	109	<i>hom.</i> 12.12	198
<i>Spir.</i> 18	57-58	Nicene Creed	17, 30-31, 37, 42, 46, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 115, 173, 177, 178, 180, 195-196, 199, 210, 212, 218, 228
<i>Spir.</i> 18-27	109	Niceno-Constanti- nopolitan Creed	2, 48 and n.221, 49, 105, 169, 181, 199-201, 217, 223, 227
<i>Spir.</i> 18.46	143, 145-147		
<i>Spir.</i> 18.47	125-129, 151- 152, 163		
<i>Spir.</i> 19.49	125		
<i>Spir.</i> 19.50	139, 154		
<i>Spir.</i> 21.52	154-159		
<i>Spir.</i> 24.55	157-158, 160		
<i>Spir.</i> 24.56	141		
<i>Spir.</i> 26.61	161-162, 164		
<i>Spir.</i> 26.62	162-165		
<i>Spir.</i> 26.63	165-166		
<i>Spir.</i> 26.64	127-128		
<i>Spir.</i> 28-29	113		
<i>Spir.</i> 29.72	51		
<i>Spir.</i> 30	105		
Cyril of Jerusalem, <i>catech.</i> 16.23	214	Origen, <i>fr.</i> 37 in <i>Jo.</i>	210
Gregory of Nazianzus, <i>carm.</i> 1.1.3	185	<i>fr.</i> 123 in <i>Jo.</i>	210-211
<i>carm.</i> 2.1.11	170-171, 181, 183-184	<i>fr.</i> 116 in <i>Lam.</i>	224
<i>or.</i> 21	172-173	<i>hom.</i> 1 in <i>Cant.</i> 2	211-212, 219-220
<i>or.</i> 31	174-177, 202	<i>hom.</i> 1 in <i>Gen.</i> 17	211, 222
<i>or.</i> 33	174 and n.34	<i>Jo.</i> 2.10-12	9, 13-16, 210, 218
<i>or.</i> 34	173-174, 178, 202, 205-207	<i>Jo.</i> 13.25	16
<i>or.</i> 41	172, 173, 202-204	<i>or.</i> 2.4	208-209
		<i>princ.</i> 1.3	9, 10-11, 209-210
		<i>princ.</i> 4.2.3	209
		<i>princ.</i> 4.4.8	208, 214
		Ps.-Basil, <i>DS</i>	25-26, n.83
		Theodore of Mopsuestia, <i>Maced.</i>	217
		Theodosius I, <i>Cod. Thds.</i> 16.1.2	178
		<i>Cod. Thds.</i> 16.1.3	199, 200

INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

Gen 1:1	78	1 Cor 2:16	209
Ex 14:31	130-131	1 Cor 3:23	144-145
Ex 33:21	162-163	1 Cor 3:16-17	67, 77, 91-92, 102, 119-120, 155, 158, 164, 165, 167, 211, 219, 221-222, 226
Ex 35:30-33	194	1 Cor 6:11	67, 77, 87-88, 101, 102, 219
Dt 6:13	192	1 Cor 6:19	211, 221-222
Dt 12:13-14	162-163, 165	1 Cor 8:6	84, 84-85, n.154
Ps 33:6	122-123, 145-147, 168	1 Cor 9:22	32-33
Ps 71:3	162-163	1 Cor 10:2	119, 131-137, 166
Ps 104:30	87	1 Cor 10:4	67, 75, 101, 131, 213
Is 61:1	89	1 Cor 11:12	144-146
Jer 2:13	73-75	1 Cor 12	161
Jer 17:12-13	73-74	1 Cor 12:3	84-85, n.154, 119, 121-129, 163, 165, 167, 168, 169, 190, 192-193, 209-210, 219, 222-223
Joel 2:28	97-98	1 Cor 12:4-6	67, 94-97, 117, 119-120, 147-152, 168, 210-211, 214, 217-218, 222, 223-224, 228, 229
Am 4:13	61 and n.23, 65, 67-68, 87	1 Cor 12:11	67, 77, 84, 86, 119, 147-150, 167, 196, 210-211, 213, 225, 226, 229
Bar 3:10-12	73-75	1 Cor 12:13	67, 73, 75, 77, 83-86, 101, 130, 161-162, 213, 226, 228
Mt 5:6	197	1 Cor 12-14	4
Mt 11:27	208	1 Cor 14:24-25	120, 147-148
Mt 28:19-20	47, 53, 56, 106, 117, 120, 130, 131, 151, 168	1 Cor 15:41	160
Lk 16:29	135-136	2 Cor 2:15	67, 77, 89-90, 101, 102, 211-212, 219-220, 226
Jn 4:23-34	103, 117, 126, 162-163, 165, 169	2 Cor 3	4
Jn 6:63	192	2 Cor 3:6	67-68, n.60
Jn 14:23	97, 211, 222	2 Cor 3:14-18	119
Jn 15:26	143-144, 145, 168, 217	2 Cor 3:17-18	67-68, n.60, 117, 120, 153-158, 167, 225-227, 229
Acts 5:4, 9	148	2 Cor 12:4	69, 71, 100
Acts 21:11	149		
Rom 11:33-34	69, 212, 214		
Rom 12:5-6	162		
1 Cor 2-3	4		
1 Cor 2:4	71		
1 Cor 2:10-12	67, 69, 77, 78-83, 99, 100-103, 116, 119-120, 137-147, 167, 168, 208-209, 212, 214-217, 226, 227, 228		

2 Cor 13:3	67, 94, 97-100, 101	1 Tim 5:21	61, 65 and n.49, 67-68,
2 Cor 13:13	67, 94-97, 102		130-131, 159-160
Phil 1:19	97-100, 101	2 Tim 3:16	158-159
Col 1:15	127	Tit 3:10	22
1 Thes 3:12-13	155-156, 158	Heb 1:3	127
2 Thes 3:5	155-156, 158	Jas 1:17	82

SUPPLEMENTS TO VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

1. TERTULLIANUS. *De idololatria*. Critical Text, Translation and Commentary by J.H. WASZINK and J.C.M. VAN WINDEN. Partly based on a Manuscript left behind by P.G. VAN DER NAT. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08105 4
2. SPRINGER, C.P.E. *The Gospel as Epic in Late Antiquity*. The *Paschale Carmen* of Sedulius. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08691 9
3. HOEK, A. VAN DEN. *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis*. An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08756 7
4. NEYMEYR, U. *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert*. Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08773 7
5. HELLEMO, G. *Adventus Domini*. Eschatological Thought in 4th-century Apocryphes and Catecheses. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08836 9
6. RUFIN VON AQUILEIA. *De ieiunio* I, II. Zwei Predigten über das Fasten nach Basileios von Kaisareia. Ausgabe mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen von H. MARTI. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08897 0
7. ROUWHORST, G.A.M. *Les hymnes pascales d'Éphrem de Nisibe*. Analyse théologique et recherche sur l'évolution de la fête pascale chrétienne à Nisibe et à Edesse et dans quelques Églises voisines au quatrième siècle. 2 vols: I. Étude; II. Textes. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08839 3
8. RADICE, R. and D.T. RUNIA. *Philo of Alexandria*. An Annotated Bibliography 1937–1986. In Collaboration with R.A. BITTER, N.G. COHEN, M. MACH, A.P. RUNIA, D. SATRAN and D.R. SCHWARTZ. 1988. repr. 1992. ISBN 90 04 08986 1
9. GORDON, B. *The Economic Problem in Biblical and Patristic Thought*. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09048 7
10. PROSPER OF AQUITAINE. *De Providentia Dei*. Text, Translation and Commentary by M. MARCOVICH. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09090 8
11. JEFFORD, C.N. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09127 0
12. DROBNER, H.R. and KLOCK, CH. *Studien zur Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09222 6
13. NORRIS, F.W. *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning*. The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen. Introduction and Commentary by F.W. NORRIS and Translation by LIONEL WICKHAM and FREDERICK WILLIAMS. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09253 6
14. OORT, J. VAN. *Jerusalem and Babylon*. A Study into Augustine's *City of God* and the Sources of his Doctrine of the Two Cities. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09323 0
15. LARDET, P. *L'Apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin*. Un Commentaire. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09457 1
16. RISCH, F.X. *Pseudo-Basilius: Adversus Eunomium IV-V*. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09558 6
17. KLIJN, A.F.J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09453 9
18. ELANSKAYA, A.I. *The Literary Coptic Manuscripts in the A.S. Pushkin State Fine Arts Museum in Moscow*. ISBN 90 04 09528 4
19. WICKHAM, L.R. and BAMMEL, C.P. (eds.). *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Essays in Tribute to George Christopher Stead. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09605 1
20. ASTERIUS VON KAPPADOKIEN. *Die theologischen Fragmente*. Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar von Markus Vinzent. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09841 0

21. HENNINGS, R. *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal. 2,11-14.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09840 2
22. BOEFT, J. DEN & HILHORST, A. (eds.). *Early Christian Poetry.* A Collection of Essays. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09939 5
23. MCGUCKIN, J.A. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy.* Its History, Theology, and Texts. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09990 5
24. REYNOLDS, Ph.L. *Marriage in the Western Church.* The Christianization of Marriage during the Patristic and Early Medieval Periods. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10022 9
25. PETERSEN, W.L. *Tatian's Diatessaron.* Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10034 2
26. GRÜNBECK, E. *Christologische Schriftargumentation und Bildersprache.* Zum Konflikt zwischen Metapherninterpretation und dogmatischen Schriftbeweistraditionen in der patristischen Auslegung des 44. (45.) Psalms. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10021 0
27. HAYKIN, M.A.G. *The Spirit of God.* The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09947 6
28. BENJAMINS, H.S. *Eingeordnete Freiheit.* Freiheit und Vorsehung bei Origenes. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10117 9